The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLIII APRIL 1957 NUMBER 2

AS YOU LIKE IT AND THE STARS: NINETEENTH-CENTURY PROMPT BOOKS

William G. B. Carson

WRITING in his diary about a performance of *As You Like It* at the Grand Opera House in St. Louis on November 16, 1877, George Barton Berrell, a young actor who had recently been elevated to the post of stage manager, recorded for posterity (he hoped) his opinions of what the stars of his day were doing to the texts of Shakespeare's plays in order to appear in the brightest possible glory.[1] Their "improvements" failed to arouse his enthusiasm. For the star of this particular production, Fanny Davenport, however, he had only kind words. "Almost every 'Rosalind,'" he says, "alters the comedy to suit herself, the alterations consisting of a few slight 'cuts' and many transpositions. 'Rosalind's' scenes are all transposed, generally in a manner that will display the star to the best advantage, and give her the termination of as many acts as possible, to allow for as many calls as there are acts." But, he goes on, "Miss Davenport doesn't appear to be as selfish as the rest of her sister stars; she retains the scene between 'Oliver' and 'Charles,' introduces the character of 'Martext,' from the original, gives a number of speeches to 'Celia,' 'Orlando,' 'Sylvius' and 'Jaques,' and only cut the scene between 'Amiens' and the latter because there is not much individual talent in our company."

Having recently been exposed to some of the atrocities committed in the name of "Art" by seventeenth- and eighteenth-century reformers of masterpieces they were incapable of appreciating, I found my curiosity asserting itself, and decided to do a little checking on my own account. Perhaps the evil that Nahum Tate, Colley Cibber, and their fellows did was not "interred with their bones" like the good, but did, as the poet says, live after them.

Of course, there is no use of being pedantic and insisting that every word that Shakespeare wrote is inviolable and that to alter one is to be guilty of sacrilege. The kind of theater Shakespeare knew disappeared half a century after his death, and when his plays were revived, something had to be done to fit them for the new stages with their fancy scenery and, even more important, for

William G. B. Carson is Professor of English and Drama and Chairman of the Division of Drama at Washington University. He is editor of The Letters of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Kean Relating to Their American Tours *(1945), and author of* The Theatre on the Frontier *(1932) and* Managers in Distress *(1949).*

[1] The diaries of George Barton Berrell are in the possession of the Missouri Historical Society in St. Louis.

the tastes and prejudices of new and very different audiences. As time passed, these differences grew greater rather than less. The scenery grew bulkier and more elaborate, and the theater-going public more and more squeamish. By the time Berrell reached the Grand Opera House on Market Street these developments had almost reached their apogee. After a few more decades the trend turned gradually in the other direction.

Fortunately for the purposes of my study, there are extant the prompt books upon which many of the nineteenth-century productions of *As You Like It* were based—too many, in fact, for analysis in a single article. I have selected a few, therefore, which I think are representative. All were prepared for the use of important stars, though in the case of the one compiled by Berrell himself I have been unable to determine for which star.

Three of the most celebrated producers of Shakespeare's plays during the last century were William Charles Macready, Charles Kean, and Samuel Phelps. All three at one time or another played in various theaters, but it is as managers that they concern us here. Macready operated Covent Garden from 1837 to 1839, and Drury Lane from Christmas of 1841 until the summer of 1843. Kean's celebrity reached its peak during his management of the Princess's Theatre from 1850 to 1859. In 1843, with the abolition of the royal patents which had restricted the production of legitimate plays to Covent Garden and Drury Lane, Phelps took over Sadler's Wells, a despised theater in a blighted section of London. In the nearly twenty years of his tenancy he presented all but six of Shakespeare's plays. But, whereas the productions of the other two managers, especially Kean's, were lavish, Phelps' were of necessity, scenically at least, extremely modest. Through the courtesy of the Folger Shakespeare Library I have studied microfilms of prompt copies used by these three men, but I have been unable, except for Phelps', which is marked "1848," to connect the prompt copies with specific productions.

A surprising feature has been the close resemblance between the stage directions written in the margins of the Macready and the Kean copies. The two actors were bitter enemies, and it seemed to me that neither would want to contaminate himself by contact with anything defiled by the other. They did, however, deign to turn to the same man, George Ellis, for the preparation of their scripts. His signature appears on one of the Macready copies at the Folger and on one of Kean's, and the handwriting on the unsigned Macready copy is almost identical with that on the signed Kean version. Even more nearly identical are the marginal notes in the books of Phelps and James W. Wallack the younger (?), but I have never heard of any feud between these two men. William E. Burton's copy presents problems because the handwriting is such a scrawl, and in places the book itself is mutilated.

For obvious reasons, I have been particularly interested in the prompt books compiled for the use of actresses who appeared as Rosalind. Of these I have had access to four, those of Charlotte Cushman, Helena Modjeska, Fanny Davenport, and Julia Marlowe. How just are Berrell's animadversions? (Of course, he knew nothing of Miss Marlowe, who rose to fame later, and whose prompt copy was prepared after the turn of the century. But her stage traditions were the same.) Miss Cushman's copy, which is in the Theatre Collection of the New York Public Library, is

CHART SHOWING ORDER OF SCENES IN THE PROMPT BOOKS

From left to right, the chart indicates the placing in each acting version of the scenes from the First Folio.

Folio	Macready	Kean	J. W. Wallack	Lester Wallack	Cushman	Phelps	Berrell	Burton	Davenport	Modjeska	Daly	Sothern & Marlowe
Act I., 1.	I,1	I,1	I,1	I,1	I,1,2	I,1	I,1	I	I,1	I,1	I,1	I,1
2.	I,2	I,2	I,2	I,2	I,3	I,2	I,2	I	I,2	I,2	I,2	I,2
3.	I,3	I,3	I,2	I,2	I,4	I,3	I,3	I	I,2	I,2	I,2	I,2
Act II., 1.	II,3	II,3	II,1	II,2	II,2	II,1	II,1	II	II,2	II,2	II,2	II,2
2.	II,1	II,1	II,2	x	x	II,2	x	x	x	x	x	x
3.	II,2	II,2	II,3	II,1	II,1	II,3	I,4	I	II,1	II,1	II,1	I,2
4.	II,4	II,4	II,4	II,2	II,3	II,4	II,1	II	II,2	II,2	II,2	II,2
5.	II,5	II,5	II,5	II,2	II,2	II,5	x	II	x	x	II,2	II,2
6.	II,6	II,6	II,6	II,3	II,3	II,6	II,2	II	II,3	II,2	II,3	II,1
7.	II,7	II,7	II,7	II,4	II,3	II,7	II,3	II	II,4	II,3	II,4	II,2
Act III., 1.	III,1	III,1	III,1	x	x	III,1	x	x	x	x	x	x
2.	III,2	III,2	III,2	III,1	III,1	III,2	III,1	III	III,1	III,1	III,1	II,3
3.	III,2	III,2	III,2	IV	III,1	III,2	III,1	III	III,1	IV,1	IV,1	III,1
4.	III,3	III,3	III,3	IV	IV,1	IV,1	IV,1	IV	IV,1	IV,1	IV,2	III,1
5.	III,3	III,3	III,4	IV	IV,2	IV,2	IV,2	IV	IV,1	IV,1	IV,3	III,1
Act IV., 1.	IV,1	IV,1	IV,1	IV	IV,3	IV,3	IV,1	IV	IV,1	IV,1	IV,4	III,1
2.	IV,1	IV,1	IV,1	x	x	IV,3	x	x	x	x	IV,4	III,1
3.	IV,2	IV,2	IV,2	IV	IV,3	V,1	V,1	IV	IV,1	IV,1	IV,5	III,1
Act V., 1.	V,1	V,1	IV,3	V,2	V,1	V,2	V,2	V	V,1	V,2	V	IV,1
2.	V,1	V,1	IV,3	V,1	V,2	V,2	V,2	V	V,1	V,1	V	IV,2
3.	V,1	V,1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	V	x
4.	V,2	V,2	V,1	V,3	V,3	V,3	V,3	V	V,2	V,3	V	IV,1

(x = complete omission of scene)

identified with a performance at the Theatre Royal, Bristol, on February 24, 1847. The Modjeska volume, at the Folger Library, has attached to it a letter signed by an unidentified "Elizabeth" which states that Count Bozenta, Madame Modjeska's husband, says that it is the copy she always used. Miss Davenport relied on a copy of French's *Standard Drama*, the edition of 1886-87, which is now in the archives of the Harvard College Library. Miss Marlowe's script, which is typewritten, bears the notation: "as played by Sothern-Marlowe—compiled & used by Frederick Kaufman General Stage Mgr. for Sothern-Marlowe." It is in the Folger collections.

There is no space in this article for mention of all—or nearly all—the cuts and changes made in Shakespeare's text by the various stars and managers who have adapted it to their own uses. A few examples will serve, I hope, to give some idea of the offences (if they be offences) that have been committed. Some are to be found in the printed texts; but most have been made by the actors themselves or by their stage managers, and are set down in ink between the lines and in the margins. In the end it amounts to the same thing. What concerns us is what reached the stage.

In the 1623 Folio, *As You Like It* is divided into five acts with a total of twenty-two scenes: three in Act I, seven in II, five in III, three in IV, and four in V. With one exception—the typewritten version of Sothern and Marlowe—the prompt books I have examined preserve the five acts. Almost invariably, however, individual scenes are omitted or at least juggled about. These rearrangements are shown in the chart on page 119.

Inasmuch as Shakespeare wrote for a stage that was innocent of scenery, whether we call the various units "acts" or "scenes" makes little difference. The only changes that count are those which affect the order or omission of scenes. Some of these changes appear to me to be justified. Almost all were necessitated by the use of ponderous sets, the manipulation of which consumed a great deal of time.

Except for the cutting of the Oliver-Charles episode referred to by Berrell and some minor deletions, Act I has been tampered with very little. True, once or twice Scene 1 is split in two, and it was fairly common practice to run the last two scenes together; but these alterations, if they really are alterations from the author's point of view, do no violence to his plan. The hapless Charles, however, is not always unmolested. Burton's prompt book is confusing, because it evidently was intended to be used for at least two different productions. In one he cuts the scene freely, and in the other he omits it altogether, the latter procedure being followed by Lester Wallack also. Learning from Dennis that Charles is in-doors, waiting to see him, Oliver (acting under Wallack's instructions), instead of speaking the lines Shakespeare set down for him, merely says, "Let him attend," and then, as soon as he is alone, gives most of the soliloquy with which the scene concludes, going inside when it is ended.

"After the first Act," records Berrell, "usually, the balance of the play is done in one scene—the Forest of Arden—thus avoiding the many changes the acting edition calls for."[2] Such an arrangement would certainly be attractive to anybody with heavy sets to be pushed around. But it does inevitably involve taking liberties with Shakespeare's scene order. The poet opens Act II in the For-

[2] Probably Samuel French's, which closely follows the John Cumberland edition of 1826.

est, but then returns to the ducal palace and, after that, to Oliver's orchard. The rest of the act takes place back in the Forest, but again in III,1, we are back in the Palace, only to return once more to the woodlands. So far as the two Palace scenes are concerned, George C. D. Odell says, "I have never seen either acted, and I have seen the play many times."[3] Nevertheless Macready, Kean, Phelps, and James Wallack kept both.

Phelps, to whom scenery is a matter of secondary importance, preserves the original sequence, but Macready and Kean have other ideas. They avoid the solution adopted by some of having the rest of Act I take place on the Duke's lawn, and play the third scene inside the Palace. By advancing II,2, to first place they save themselves a shift during the intermission. Then they return to Oliver's for the flight of Orlando and Adam, and finally, by II,3, they are ready to proceed to the Forest. After all, no real harm has been done.

The Orlando-Adam scene not being expendable, various devices are tried to fit it in comfortably. Only Phelps leaves it where it grew. Most of the others, cutting the Palace scene, use it to open Act II. But Burton and Miss Marlowe's Mr. Kaufman are more original. Burton simply tacks it on to the end of Act I, thereby robbing his leading lady of her (purloined) curtain line.[4] Kaufman goes further. He brings Adam on to the scene of the wrestling just after Le Beau has warned Orlando that he will be well advised to leave town, and thus his revelation of Oliver's murderous intentions adds force to the courtier's words. The two promptly take flight, Adam having had the foresight to bring his moneybag with him. Then the Princesses enter, Rosalind is banished, and Miss Marlowe has her curtain.

In Act II some transpositions have been made, but nothing very serious. But there are omissions, notably that of Scene 5 by Berrell, Modjeska, and Davenport. It is in this scene that Jaques and Amiens disport themselves, and the latter sings "Under the greenwood tree." According to Berrell, this scene was usually left out "for the reason that it is very difficult to find an 'Amiens' who can sing." (It may not be amiss to note that Shakespeare is careful to prepare for such a contingency by having Amiens apologize for the condition of his voice.)

Burton, having presented all of Act I in one set, does the same with II. Having moved the Adam scene to I and cut Scene 2, he is ready to follow the lead of William Shakespeare, and that he does—in so far at least as sequence is concerned. Daly indulges in some strange juggling. He begins the act in Oliver's orchard, then, for some reason known perhaps to himself, puts 5 ahead of 1. That being done, he has Orlando and Adam enter immediately after the girls and Touchstone. Why haven't they met on the way? Shakespeare is careful to avoid that collision. As for Sothern and Marlowe (through Kaufman), they advance 6, in which Adam collapses from hunger, to the beginning of the act, and, having disposed of 3 in the first act and omitted 2, they close the act with III,2, so that the lady can occupy her strategic position when the curtain falls.

There is no need to analyze here all the shifts to which Act III has been subjected inasmuch as they are shown on the chart, but a few do call for attention. Recalling Berrell's comment that most actresses cast as the heroine manipulated the text in such a way as to get themselves centre stage with a good line on their lips every time the curtain

[3] George C. D. Odell, *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving* (New York, 1920), II, 22.

[4] See p. 125.

descended, we may check the prompt books to see whether or not the young man was being over-cynical. Of the women stars whose productions come under our scrutiny, only Charlotte Cushman throws away her opportunity at the end of this act. Fanny Davenport sees to it that she is in the right place at the right time; and Daly has Ada Rehan there too. Their curtains fall on Rosalind's "Nay, you must call me 'Rosalind.' Come, sister, will you go?" at the close of Shakespeare's III,2 (Daly cuts the question). But Miss Marlowe, who plans to compress the play into four acts, jumps ahead to the "bloody napkin" episode at the end of the original Act IV, and has an effective "curtain" there. "Will you commend my counterfeiting to him to-morrow?" she asks Oliver. The "to-morrow" was Kaufman's idea, not Shakespeare's, who closes his act on another "Will you go?" The author, not concerned with effective curtain lines, ends his Act III with a weak line in the mouth of a minor character, Phoebe. Investigation shows that Berrell is not far wrong, and that this ending enjoyed small favor in the nineteenth century, being retained only by Macready, Kean, and James Wallack.

Instead of featuring either Rosalind or Phoebe, Miss Cushman, Burton, Phelps, and Berrell choose Touchstone at this point. (Note: Touchstone was one of Burton's good parts.) Enter here Sir Oliver Martext, the "hedge-parson"; that is, when he does enter. This character seems to me to have been written into the play to provide a role for some actor or to caricature some contemporary type. So far as the plot is concerned, he is far from essential. The very little he has to do, he does at the end of Scene 3, where Jaques persuades Touchstone not to rely on his offices to unite him with Audrey. James Wallack, Modjeska, Berrell, and Davenport dispense with him. (Miss Davenport was still keeping him in 1877.) Even when spared, the poor man has very little to say, and sometimes he is robbed of part of that. From Burton's mutilated copy, I conclude that he sometimes kept him, and sometimes did not.

The liberties taken with Act IV surpass those taken earlier in the play, but I shall leave most of them to the chart. One, however, cannot be ignored, for it is perhaps the most harmful in the play.

Shakespeare, practical man of the theater that he was, knew that when the characters are required to do certain things off stage, they must be allowed sufficient time to make the audience accept the illusion that they have done them. This problem may be solved in either of two ways. One is to have so much happen on stage during their absence that the audience will accept the convention that the hands of behind-the-scene clocks move very fast. The other device is to introduce a scene which occurs in another place. Then there are sure to be no questions asked.

In Act IV Shakespeare finds himself confronted with a problem of this kind. Orlando, having reluctantly left the equally reluctant Rosalind to keep a luncheon engagement with the banished Duke, on his way to the latter's cave stumbles upon a man sleeping under a tree, all unconscious of the fact that a "green and gilded snake" and a "suck'd and hungry lioness" are about to liquidate him. To his surprise, Orlando recognizes the sleeper as Oliver, his wicked brother. After a few seconds of not unnatural hesitation, he overcomes his resentment and attacks. The serpent glides away, but the lioness does battle for her rights, and before she is disposed of, inflicts painful wounds on her adversary. Oliver awakes, and there now follows a fraternal reconciliation. Then the re-

formed villain accompanies his brother to the cave, where he administers first aid. Orlando now sends him back to Rosalind, who is not supposed to be expecting him for two hours, to explain his overlong absence. All this, one would expect to take some little time, and Shakespeare is careful to make it all seem plausible.

After Orlando's exit the author has the two girls indulge themselves in some small talk, after which Rosalind goes off to "find a shadow and sigh" to while away the two hours, and Celia, more prosaically, to take a nap. As soon as they have gone and the stage has been cleared, we are assumed to have moved to another part of the Forest, and Jaques and several Lords come on to pass a few moments with some jokes and a song about a slaughtered deer they are carrying. Having satisfied themselves, they depart, and we are back, presumably, in front of the girls' cottage. Evidently quite some time has passed, for the sighing and the nap are over. In a moment the girls are joined by poor Silvius, bearing the "waspish" letter from Phoebe, and there follows a scene in which the letter is read and ridiculed, and the lovelorn youth is tormented by "Ganymede." By the time this is over, no audience would be fussy enough to check its watches or to cavil at the entrance of Oliver with his napkin and the tale that causes the pretended youth to swoon.

That is the way Shakespeare ordered it. How have his plans fared at the hands of nineteenth-century actors and actresses? Macready, Kean, and James Wallack retain this cover scene and most of the other dialogue except what they felt must be expurgated. Phelps goes his own way, but his version is all right, since he ends his act with the deer scene, and anything can happen during an intermission. Modjeska and Davenport, on the other hand, not only jettison the deer, but cut some of the girls' lines, bring Silvius on instantly, and then leave but little of his scene. The result is that Oliver shows up within about five minutes of Orlando's exit, and Shakespeare's planning comes all to naught.

It remains, however, for Sothern and Marlowe to make the strangest change of all. The entire third act of their version is set before the girls' cottage. After the offended Phoebe has dragged Silvius from the stage (the last scene of Act II in the original), there is a "Cornet flourish off L.U.E.," and Amiens enters with various other Lords, bearing the slaughtered stag. He is met by Jaques, who inquires, "What is he that killed the deer?" Immediately, as Shakespeare directs, they all burst into song. The two girls, quite naturally, come to the door to see who is making all the racket, and listen while Amiens chants his "glee." After some pretty childish byplay, the huntsmen go their ways and Celia returns to her nap, leaving Rosalind and Jaques to bandy witticisms. In a moment Orlando hurries on, whereupon the melancholy one tactfully removes himself, and the lovers with the help of Celia, whose siesta is once more interrupted, go through the mock marriage ceremony. That over, Orlando is off to the Duke, and, presto, Silvius appears. Nine lines are deducted from this already short scene, and then, lo and behold, here is Oliver, who arrives almost before his brother has had time to get out of sight!

When we come to Act V, we find Macready and Kean again hewing to the line and adhering to the prescribed sequence of scenes, retaining even 3, the brief one in which the two Pages sing "It was a lover and his lass" to Touchstone and Audrey. This scene is cut by

everyone else except Daly, who, however, inserts it between 1 and 2. James Wallack in his unique arrangement, having moved the first two scenes forward to Act IV, dispenses with 3, and has only the final one left. For Sothern and Marlowe IV is the last act, and it is composed of 2,1, and 4 of Shakespeare's V in that strange order. Furthermore, they omit the Epilogue, being the only ones to do so completely, although it is often cut in part by the others.

Berrell says that a few lines of Rosalind's in this act are always omitted, "because, after speaking them, there would scarcely be time enough to change from boy's dress to female attire." His "always" is something of an exaggeration, for the passage, awkward as it must be for the ladies, has been removed only by Davenport, Burton, Modjeska, Sothern and Marlowe, and Berrell himself. The others keep it.

The Hymen episode at the close of the act is treated with varying degrees of respect and disrespect. If taken literally, it is a little hard to accept. The sudden introduction into the midst of the very human inhabitants of the Forest of Arden of even so minor a deity is, it is true, rather hard to swallow. But if one remembers that at the time the play was written, masques were theatrical commonplaces, and accepts the episode as such, then except for the fact that it does interrupt the smooth course of events, the difficulty evaporates. Macready and Kean assume that it is nothing more than a little make-believe and go through with it. James Wallack, though noting that it is "generally omitted," does likewise. Miss Cushman retains the god, but seals his lips. On the other hand, he is left out by Burton, Davenport, Modjeska, Berrell, Sothern and Marlowe, and apparently Lester Wallack.

As I said above, I have not attempted to mention more than a fraction of the transpositions and omissions to which the play has been subjected because of the demands of the scenery so dear to the nineteenth-century heart. But the scenery cannot be held to blame for all the assaults upon the integrity of Shakespeare's script. Many of the others were motivated by the vanity of the stars and the prudishness of the public.

On a piece of blue paper pasted into a prompt book in the Theatre Collection of the New York Public Library, which is identified with "Drury Lane 1846," the following words have been written: "Mr Macready gave all of Jacques [*sic*] previous to Act 2 Sce 5 to 1st Lord Merely, I suppose to get Mr Phelps into the cast. I have kept the lines in for Jacques." Inasmuch as the manager of the Theatre Royal in 1846 was the versatile Alfred Bunn, it seems reasonable to assume that he is the "I" referred to. How he must have relished setting his bitter foe to rights! It is just too bad that before doing so he did not consult the author of the play. He might not have gloated so happily.

When Charles Johnson's *Love in a Forest*, one of the current perversions of Shakespeare, was mounted at Drury Lane in the season of 1722-23, Colley Cibber, in the words of Odell, "could, as manager, fatten his slender part with these good lines, even though they make Jaques a vain coxcomb, thus publicly to admire his own thoughts, in the description he gives of his 'similes' on the fate of the deer."[5] One would think that this instance of execrable taste would have enjoyed short shrift, but unfortunately Cibber found many followers, some in unexpected places. Genest in his comment on the Johnson piece has

[5] Odell, I, 245.

this to say: "When Duke Alberto enters with his friends, the speech about the wounded stag is very properly taken from the first Lord and given to Jaques; an improvement which is still retained on the stage."[6] Mr. Genest to the contrary notwithstanding, it should not have been retained. And yet he is in one sense correct, for it was retained for many years—by John Philip Kemble, both Wallacks, Burton, Berrell, Davenport, and Modjeska, among others.

This is the most flagrant of the thefts, but it is by no means the only one, though most of the others are minor. One occurs at the close of Act I. The girls have decided on flight, and as they leave the stage, Celia exclaims: "Now go we in content/To liberty, and not to banishment." But this is too good a curtain line, with its nice rhyme-tag, to be surrendered by any self-respecting star to a mere underling, and most of our lady stars were very self-respecting. I am unable to check on Miss Cushman, but I can indict Miss Davenport, Mme. Modjeska, Miss Marlowe, and the ladies, whoever they were, who were being exploited by Burton, Berrell, and Lester Wallack.

In addition to the deletions and transpositions, I have found a few non-Shakespearean additions. I shall mention only two. The first is puzzling because I cannot be absolutely sure that it was actually used. In the margin of Burton's script, immediately after Orlando has left to bring the starving Adam to the Duke's table and just before Jaques speaks his piece on the Seven Ages of Man, there is jotted down a doggerel verse on the same theme but without the seven divisions. The stage direction says, "Advance," and a little diagram shows that the Duke is to stand stage centre and Jaques stage left. Now stage centre was in those days a post of vantage usually reserved for speakers. So it looks to me as if the Duke's part were in this case "fattened" by this verse, which has been identified by Mr. Giles E. Dawson of the Folger Library as "an old ballad, Poor Robin's Dream, commonly called Poor Charity." But I do not know what was done.

When, in January 1741, Charles Fleetwood restored *As You Like It* to its rightful place after the usurpation of *Love in a Forest*, he cast his singing comedienne, the delectable Kitty Clive, as Celia. He decided—or perhaps she did—that she must have a song to sing. The poet not having been obliging enough to provide one, the obliging manager cast about and came up with "When daisies pied," a ditty warbled by the Page in *Love's Labour's Lost*. But, as in the case of the *banishment* line, poor Celia was not left long in possession. What is more, John Cumberland included the song in his edition of the play, and was followed by Samuel French in his widely used acting edition. In fact, it is to be doubted if one person in fifty who saw *As You Like It* realized that it did not belong there.[7]

The ditty is interpolated in Act IV, Scene 2, after Rosalind in her male disguise has warned her lover of woman's wiles. Its theme is the disturbing effect that the cuckoo's song has upon "the married ear." Odell finds it rather indelicate and wholly unsuitable to a gently reared young princess. Yet, if one checks over Shakespeare's unexpurgated text and notes some of the lines he assigns to these modest damsels, one is not so sure that it is out of character. Inappropriate or not, the ladies loved it. Even the proper and pious Mary Anderson was happy to

[6] John Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage, from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830* (Bath, 1832), III, 101.

[7] Odell, I, 262.

sing it,[8] and that daughter of the Puritans, Charlotte Cushman, having started her career as a singer, featured it in her publicity. Miss Davenport used it too, and Lester Wallack and Berrell include it in their versions. As for Burton, he instructs his Rosalind to sing it "first to R, then L, alternately weeping Poutting and Pettishly." Of course, Macready, Kean, and Phelps will none of it, and James Wallack scorns it too. (N.B. Only Kean had a wife who played Rosalind.) At last, however, by the end of the century the cuckoo's voice was stilled, and neither Miss Rehan nor Miss Marlowe quoted his scandalous insinuations.

In his *The Theater of Augustin Daly* Marvin Felheim says, apropos of Daly's version: "The many cuts 'in the interest of good taste' involved the typical deletion of lines of Elizabethan smut together with the accustomed changes of words: 'God' to 'Heaven,' 'spit' to 'cough,' and 'bastard' to 'little child.' "[9] But Daly was not the only Victorian. Thomas Bowdler's famous *Family Shakespeare,* in which "those words and expressions are omitted which cannot with propriety be read aloud in a family," set the tone. This propriety actors and managers could not afford to defy.

As Elizabethan plays go, *As You Like It* is relatively free from coarseness, but there are not a few passages which the nineteenth century considered too broad. Such lines might be understandable in the mouth of a crude Elizabethan clown or a simple countryman like Corin, to whom it certainly does not occur that they are vulgar in the least, but they must not be uttered where refined people might hear them. One glaring instance of this sort of thing is the very frank conversation between Touchstone and Corin (III,2) in which the relative merits of country and court life are discussed. In every prompt book this is scratched out or rigorously expurgated. Doubtful too is Touchstone's "Come, sweet Audrey,/We must be married or we must live in bawdry" (III,3). Yet it does survive the qualms of James Wallack, Cushman, Berrell, Davenport, and even Sothern and Marlowe. Macready, Kean, Phelps, and Lester Wallack drew the line there. But most surprising is the virtuous attitude of Burton, who was by no means famous for refinement.

Such lines, if perhaps comprehensible in the mouths of the lower classes, are simply beyond the pale when it comes to the "best people," especially young princesses who should really follow the example of dear Queen Victoria. Consequently there is almost complete unanimity of expurgation. Rosalind, for instance, is not permitted to mention the little cony's being "kindled" or the snails' having horns. Nowhere do these scruples manifest themselves more strangely than in the change made in Rosalind's reply to Celia's query concerning her agitation after their first meeting with Orlando. "But is all this for your father?" she asks. "No," answers her cousin, "some of it is for my child's father." Such a pother as has been raised by that! Furness quotes Coleridge's dictum: "Who can doubt that this is a mistake for 'my father's child,' meaning herself? According to Theobald's note, a most indelicate anticipation is put into the mouth of Rosalind without reason."[10] After quoting Mrs. Jameson to the effect that proprieties have a way of changing, the editor of the *Variorum* washes his hands of the whole question. It was Rowe who started it all, but he had a great follow-

[8] *Ibid.*, II, 206.
[9] (Cambridge, 1956), p. 246.
[10] Horace Howard Furness, *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: As You Like It* (Philadelphia, 1890), p. 49.

ing which included Macready, James Wallack, the modest Burton, Modjeska, Davenport, and Marlowe. When all is said and done, however, it seems to me that one reading makes just about as good sense as the other.

When it comes to reaching some conclusion as to the justice of Berrell's charges, I think we find that, despite some exaggeration, his accusations are not without some basis. No one of the prompt books I have read shows scrupulous adherence to Shakespeare's intentions. Most of the alterations, I believe, did appear to the stars or stage managers who compiled the books to be justified by current conditions. Some, of course, but possibly fewer than one might expect, were dictated by selfishness and vanity, some by bad taste.

On the whole, the men were more conscientious than the women, but then *As You Like It* is primarily Rosalind's play. As I pointed out above, Mrs. Kean included Rosalind in her repertory, but her husband made no alterations to exploit her. When he, Macready, and Phelps took part, their role was Jaques, but they did not rob the First Lord of his speeches for their own benefit, or make any other "improvements." The only character Lester Wallack played was Orlando, and there was little build-up possible in his case. Burton, on the other hand, used Touchstone as a medium to display his comic gifts. His copy shows that he did nothing to hide the Clown's light under a bushel. He helped himself to Le Beau's, "He cannot speak, my Lord," after the wrestling bout, and he cut few of Touchstone's lines that he did not feel prudishness would abhor.

After studying Berrell's version one might feel that he did not practice what he preached, since it embodies some of the changes to which he takes exception. Yet it must be remembered that he is not likely to have been a free agent. When he prepared the book, he almost certainly had some star looking over his shoulder.

As for the ladies, they were prone, as their copies show, to make the most of their opportunities, engineering themselves into strategic positions and picking up a good line here and there. They cut very freely; and yet I must say that they left out almost as many of their own lines as those belonging to anyone else. None lost sight of the fact that time must be economized. People must not be kept in their seats all night.

After all, *As You Like It* survived. It enjoyed great popularity during the last century and, until recently, in this one. However much scholars and critics might grumble, the people who went to see the play were not disturbed. No doubt they liked the "Cuckoo Song," whatever its source, and it did not disturb them that the First Lord was robbed of his patrimony. Today the comedy is going through a period of neglect. It has not been seen very often of late, but one may feel encouraged, for some revivals are being announced. Let us hope that actors and the managers will be more mindful of the fact that Shakespeare usually knew what he was doing. They will not be hampered by cumbersome realistic flats and drops as were their predecessors. At all events in these days of Tennessee Williams, Arthur Miller, and their fellow playwrights, managers will not have to worry lest Rosalind's frankness and Touchstone's earthiness frighten audiences out of the theater.

W. T. STEAD ON THE ART OF PUBLIC SPEAKING

Joseph O. Baylen and Patrick G. Hogan

Introduction

LAST year the British Broadcasting Corporation presented a vignette biography of William T. Stead entitled "The Man Who Always Ran." Stead was indeed always on the run. The son of an impecunious Northumbrian Nonconformist clergyman,[1] he began his career as the innovator of the "New Journalism" when he assumed the editorial direction of the *Darlington Northern Echo* in 1871. During his tenure as editor of the *Northern Echo* (1871-1880) he became convinced that "the Press was the greatest agency for influencing the public known in the world: the true and only lever by which thrones and governments could be shaken and the masses . . . raised."[2] Nor did Stead modify his conviction when he went up to London to become John Morley's assistant editor on the *Pall Mall Gazette*. Although his resourcefulness, eagerness, and bold manner in getting to know the outstanding personalities of his time somewhat shocked Morley, he so won the respect of his chief that in 1883 Morley willingly stepped aside for Stead to assume the editorship of the *Gazette*.

Under the editorial direction of Stead, the *Pall Mall Gazette* was marked by the widespread use of the personal interview to record not only the views of important people, but also his personal impressions of those interviewed. His objective was always to dramatize events and persons as he found them.

In 1890 Stead (in a brief partnership with George Newnes) inaugurated the *Review of Reviews*. The period during which he acted as publisher and editor of this new type of journal coincided with his growing interest in Spiritualism, his espousal of the International Peace Movement which culminated in the First Hague Peace Conference in 1899, and his ardent advocacy of the cause of the Boers during the South African War at the risk of his career, his fortune, and even his personal safety.[3] But Stead's courage was only one of the many qualities which contributed to make this man of so many enthusiasms "the most creative and invigorating force in modern journalism."[4]

The wide range of Stead's friendships and acquaintances during his long career as journalist enabled him to observe closely the great and the near-great of his time. His deep interest in the ability of men to influence and direct public opinion through oral as well as written expression made him a close (although

Joseph O. Baylen is Head of the Division of Social Science at the Delta State College, Cleveland, Mississippi. Patrick G. Hogan is Associate Professor of English at the Mississippi State College, State College, Mississippi. *Professor Baylen found the Stead manuscript among the journalist's unpublished papers. He was assisted in the editing by Professor Hogan.*

[1] On the career of W. T. Stead (1849-1912), see Harold Herd, *The Making of Modern Journalism* (London, 1926), Chap. II; Frederic Whyte, *The Life of W. T. Stead* (London, 1925).

[2] Herd, p. 23; J. W. Robertson Scott, *The Life and Death of a Newspaper* (London, 1952), pp. 94-95.

[3] Joseph O. Baylen, "Notes and Documents: A Letter on the Hopes of Smuts," *The Journal of Negro History*, XLI (January, 1956), 69-70.

[4] Herd, p. 38.

not a very discerning) student of public speaking and political oratory in England during the latter half of the Victorian era.[5] He certainly reflected the intense interest of Victorians in the ability of a man as an orator and in the methods and techniques which contributed to effective speaking. Herein lies the value of this manuscript on "The Art of Public Speaking" which Stead apparently prepared during late 1905 or early 1906.[6] It is not an essay in rhetorical criticism or analysis but a series of camera shots of nineteenth-century speechmaking in progress. It records dramatic moments of political oratory together with responses and speculations of a remarkable man of the people, once described by an affectionate colleague as "a compound of Don Quixote and Phineas T. Barnum."[7]

Stead's judgments on oratory and orators spring from no critical system (as he would be the first to admit).[8] His is an impressionistic approach to speaking. If criticism in any sense, it is criticism on the run. The judgments and responses he records are highly personal and strongly influenced by his predispositions toward the speakers' themes; they are focused chiefly on the outward evidences of oratorical artistry.

Between knowledge of subject and the command and delivery of a speech, there runs the rough and tortuous trail that passes among the many thoughts that might be included in the speech, the alternative patterns that could be adopted for control of ideas, and the multitude of symbolizations from which the intending speaker must select according to his needs. Stead does not accompany speakers on this portion of their journey from idea to audience effect. He sees them only before and after. He points to their knowledge, then hurries on to record their command of discourse already ordered in the mind and, often, to recreate his own responses at climactic moments in the finished address. All this would be of much less value to another generation were it not that Stead's responses in the presence of popular oratory resembled closely those of a considerable segment of the newly franchised English "democracy."

In the famous essay wherein he christened Stead's reportorial and critical methods "a new journalism which a clever and energetic man has recently invented," Matthew Arnold insisted that the spirit and practice of the new journalism and the new democracy were the same, springing from the same mental and emotional predispositions.[9] Perhaps Arnold held too dim a view of the new spirit and its journalism, but some of what he said may be fairly applied to Stead's hurried thoughts on public speaking:

> It [the "new journalism"] has much to recommend it; it is full of ability, novelty, variety, sensation, sympathy, generous instincts; its one great fault is that it . . . throws assertions at a venture because it wishes them true; does

[5] On Stead's abortive proposal to publish in the *Pall Mall Gazette* "a collection of personal experiences . . . by the leading orators of the day" which would serve as advice to the "average Englishman [who finds it difficult] to . . . speak without looking ashamed of himself . . . ," see W. T. Stead to W. E. Gladstone, October 7, 1888, Gladstone Papers, Add. MS. 44303, Vol. CCXVIII, British Museum.

[6] We are deeply indebted to Miss Estelle W. Stead and Mr. W. K. Stead for permission to study and use this manuscript. We publish Stead's text from the manuscript without change or correction.

[7] Alfred Milner, a *Pall Mall Gazette* staff member, quoted in Whyte, I, 204.

[8] We are grateful to Professor Carroll C. Arnold for his rhetorical analysis of the manuscript, which comprises the last three paragraphs of our introduction.

[9] Matthew Arnold, "Up to Easter," *Nineteenth Century*, CXXIII (May, 1887), 629-43ff.

not correct them or itself if they are false, and to get at the state of things as they truly are seems to feel no concern whatever.[10]

Assuredly Stead's treatment of speaking and speakers lacks order and analytical standards of valuation and comparison. It is marked in every paragraph by venturesome and even gross simplifications or casual inferences. Certainly, too, it reflects little wish to wrest from experience objectively reliable principles of oratory. His essay is, as he admits, "discursive gossip about the art of speaking and the great speakers whom I have heard"; yet, with all its faults, it gives us a gallery of vivid pictures of European and British speakers in action. At several points it also suggests the atmosphere of conviction, excitement, and homage in which the liberal democracy, especially of England, heard the leader-spokesmen of their political faith.

THE ART OF PUBLIC SPEAKING

By W. T. Stead

To learn to speak well, begin early and never leave off. When proposing a vote of thanks to the Countess of Warwick[11] on one occasion when she had lectured at Browning Hall, I said she spoke wonderfully well considering that she had never spoken in public until she was thirty. The compliment was deserved, but she is by no means an orator. Beginning too late she never acquired the indispensable faculty of letting herself go. That would be an interesting inquiry to set on foot, which would endeavour to ascertain the age at which well known public orators first were heard to speak in public. Most good speakers begin early. It is the best way to acquire self possession, the first essential to effective public speech.

In the year 1885, I was suddenly called upon for the first time in my life to address great audiences. My prosecution was pending, and my lawyers decided that no one could so well convince the public, of the nature[12] of my motives as myself,[13] I was much to my dismay summoned to address a series of public meetings in the largest towns in the United Kingdom. I went to my revered old friend, Cardinal Manning, and asked him whether out of the rich stores of his immense experience he had any word of wisdom to give me that would stand me in good stead during my platform campaign. The Cardinal replied without a moments hesitation: "Yes I

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 638. Not long after the publication of Arnold's article, Stead wrote to J. W. Robertson Scott: "you mention as a chief feature of the New Journalism the conscientiousness with which it tries to get to the bottom of things before pronouncing on them. This is precisely an opposite remark to that made by Matthew Arnold, who imputed to me—most injustly—an indifference to my facts. If there is one thing which I am always preaching it is 'Get to know your facts.'" J. W. Robertson Scott, *The Day Before Yesterday* (London, 1951), p. 274.

[11] Frances Evelyn Greville, Countess Warwick (1861-1938), was prominent for her identification with movements for social reform and activities in the Fabian movement and Labour Party. See her *Life's Ebb and Flow* (London, 1929).

[12] The word "nature" was substituted by Stead in the text for "excellence."

[13] A reference to "The Maiden Tribute" agitation inspired by Stead as editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* in 1885. When apprised that Parliament was about to ignore a bill raising the age of consent for young girls above thirteen, Stead resolved to dispel the silence with which his Victorian contemporaries had cloaked the white slave traffic and to force the nation to face the sordid facts. After demonstrating the ease with which a young virgin could be procured, he published a shocking exposé in his newspaper entitled "The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon." As a result, he was execrated by prudes, prosecuted, and sentenced to Holloway Gaol for three months for abduction, but he gained a great personal victory when Parliament enacted the *Criminal Law Amendment Act* of 1885. While awaiting trial, Stead addressed numerous meetings organized by humanitarians and sympathizers who raised some £6,000 for his defense. Whyte, I, Chaps. VIII, IX, X; Herd, pp. 30-32.

have. It is this: Be full of your subject and forget yourself." It is a saying full of good sense which may be commended to all those who are called upon to address their fellowmen.

Yet like all good sayings it needs qualifications. "Be full of your subject" but not too full. Some speakers are so full of their theme that they are like an inverted bottle that is so full the contents can hardly come out.

"Forget yourself," but do not forget to be yourself. For all effective utterance by pen or by speech is self-expression, and self-suppression is as much to be deprecated as self-assertion.

The most effective orator I have ever heard was an Italian ex-friar, an old Garibaldian, Signor Gavazzi[14] by name, who lectured in England when I was in my teens. Allowance must be made for the impressionable character of youth, but I never heard or saw any man with such a mastery over his audience as Signor Gavazzi. He was addressing some five thousand men and women of the hard hearted North Country type. He was speaking in English, which was to him an acquired and foreign language. But not Mr Gladstone in the zenith of his splendid powers, nor Mr Bright nor any other orator of platform or of pulpit ever left on my mind so deep an impression as to the magic wonderworking capacity of oratory.

Gavazzi played on his hearers as if they were an old fiddle in the grasp of Paganini. He made them literally laugh and cry at will. He would one moment hush them in spellbound silence and the next by a word or a gesture he would explode the charged mine of their enthusiasm into deafening cheers. As I listened to him I first understood why Demosthenes insisted so strenuously on action, or delivery as the first, second and third secret of successful oratory. For Gavazzi did not merely speak with his lips. He was eloquent to his finger tips, and to the soles of his sandaled feet. Possessed of a striking physiognomy, a massive head of hair, eyes of fire and a singularly mobile mouth, he had every physical advantage to support his penetrating and musical voice. He was a flame of fire in his more passionate moments, while his quick humour played like summer lightning over his audience.

Gavazzi was an Italian with all the dramatic genius of his countrymen. The most eloquent English orators have nearly all been Irishmen, altho' some have been Scotchmen, of whom the names of Mr Gladstone, Mr Balfour, and Lord Roseberry at once recur. Mr Bright[15] and Mr Chamberlain[16] are almost the only purely English orators of our time. Cobden[17] and Lord Salisbury,[18] both of whom were effective and

[14] Alessandro Gavazzi (1809-1889), an ex-monk of the Barnabite Order and prominent Italian liberal who after participating in the upheavals of 1848 took refuge as an exile in England. In 1850, he left the Roman Catholic Church to begin a career of preaching in London. Ten years later, Gavazzi joined Garibaldi and his "Red Shirts" and after the unification of Italy returned to England on a successful lecture tour. See Arnold Whitridge, *Men in Crisis. The Revolutions of 1848* (New York, 1949), p. 175.

[15] Frances Feris, "The Speech Preparation of John Bright," *QJS*, XVII (November, 1931), 492-504; Joseph O. Baylen, "John Bright as Speaker and Student of Speaking," *QJS*, XLI (April, 1955), 159-68.

[16] Joseph Chamberlain (1836-1914), statesman and Radical politician, broke with Gladstone over the Irish Home Rule question and became a Liberal Unionist. He was bitterly disliked by Stead for his responsibility in provoking the Boer War (1899-1902). See William T. Stead, *The Scandal of the South African Committee. A Plain Narrative for Plain Men* (London, 1899).

[17] Richard Cobden (1804-1865), statesman, economist, and partner of Bright in the famous Anti-Corn Law campaign and in opposition to the Crimean War. See Baylen, pp. 161-62.

[18] Robert Arthur Talbot Gascoyne-Cecil, Third Marquis of Salisbury (1830-1903), British diplomat and Prime Minister, was noted as a master of satire and caustic comment in public speaking. *DNB, Supplement, 1901-1911*, I, 329-43ff.

convincing speakers would have disclaimed all pretensions to oratory.

Mr Morley[19] is an effective essayist on his feet. "I know the secret of how to be a great orator," said a saucy girl when she returned from her first political meeting where Mr Morley had been speaking. "It is quite easy. You say two or three sentences very slowly and then wait for the applause." Pope put slowness of speech as the first secret of oratorical success, but Mr Haldane,[20] the most eloquent Scotchman in Parliament, speaks with the rapidity of a motor car while panting stenographers toil after him in vain.

The Irish are much the most eloquent of the English speaking nations. Even in America Mr W J Bryan, the only politician who was ever selected as presidential candidate for his mellifluous speech, is of Irish descent. In the eighteenth century the great parliamentary orators were Irishmen. Burke, Sheridan, Gratham [sic], Curran, and Flood were all Irish. Plunkett, Sheil, O'Connell, Magee, A. M. Sullivan, and Sexton in the nineteenth all stand in the front rank. In the present Parliament, Mr Redmond,[21] Mr. T. P. O'Connor,[22] and T. M. Healy[23] are the most effective speakers. For facility of expression, grace of delivery and fervour of utterance I never heard anyone to equal, much less excel Mr A. M. Sullivan.[24] But the Irish speaker whose speeches carry the most weight was not an orator at all. Charles Stuart Parnell[25] was a cold sternly restrained speaker, but his simplest word was law.

The secret of the Irish preeminence in oratory is often attributed to their temperament. They are more emotional, and quick witted and more responsive than the slower blooded Saxon. There is something in this no doubt, but in this as in other departments of human endeavour, genius largely consists of an infinite power of taking pains. The Irish alone of the nations of the United Kingdom have kept up the practice of after dinner speaking. We still have formal public dinners in England where there is speaking and to spare. But in private it is the exception to find any speeches delivered at dinners where no reporters are invited. This is quite otherwise in Ireland. I well remember my surprise to discover on my first visit to the distressful country with what rigour the custom of after dinner speaking was kept up in private. After the Plan of Campaign had been proclaimed at Woodford in Galway in 1886[26] I was a guest at two

[19] John, Viscount Morley of Blackburn (1838-1923), Liberal statesman, editor, and essayist, served as editor of *The Fortnightly Review* until his election to Parliament in 1873 and as editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* from 1880 to 1883 when he was succeeded by Stead. On his long association with Stead, see Morley's *Recollections* (London, 1917), *passim*.

[20] Richard Burdon, First Viscount Haldane of Cloan (1856-1925), Liberal statesman, was noted for his excellence as an extempore lecturer. Sir Frederick Maurice, *Haldane 1856-1915* (London, 1937), I, 29, 80.

[21] John Edward Redmond (1856-1918), Irish political leader who was ranked as one of the foremost debaters in the House of Commons. *DNB, Supplement, 1912-1921*, pp. 447-52.

[22] Thomas Power O'Connor (1848-1929), Irish journalist and nationalist politician, was an active participant in Gladstone's famed Midlothian Campaign of 1880, but later distinguished himself as "one of the most voluble and pertinacious talkers" in opposition to the Gladstone government. *DNB, Supplement, 1922-1934*, pp. 643-44.

[23] Timothy Michael Healy (1855-1931), Irish statesman and first governor-general of the Irish Free State. *DNB, Supplement, 1931-1940*, pp. 412-15.

[24] Alexander M. Sullivan (1830-1884), Irish politician and ardent nationalist, was rated as one of the most effective orators in the Irish Home Rule movement. *DNB*, XIX, 157-58.

[25] Charles Stuart Parnell (1846-1891), the "uncrowned king of Ireland," who, unlike most of his Irish colleagues, had very little faith in parliamentary oratory to further his cause. Generally, "His speeches, though . . . incisive and earnest in tone, were rarely eloquent or even animated." *DNB*, XV, 322-42ff.

[26] The General Election of July 1886, which was fought by Gladstone on the issue of Irish Home Rule, split the Liberal party in a campaign that was especially fierce in Ireland. As a result, Salisbury and the Conservatives and

dinners, one was of a quasi-public nature, and there I was not surprised at the toast list. The other was a small dinner at the parish priest[']s. I think there were five or six of us all told, but everyone of us had to propose a toast, and every one had to respond. Nor were these speeches mere shuffling apologies for articulate utterance. They were set speeches as eloquent and as carefully finished as if they had been prepared for a public function. This constant practice, night after night, keeps the Irish orator in trim. He is accustomed to speak and to think on his legs. Hence when he crosses the Channel he is to the Saxon what the highly trained Regular soldier is to the raw recruit.

One of the most eloquent orators whom I ever heard was Joseph Cowen,[27] the friend of Kossuth and of Garibaldi, the Tribune of the North. He spoke with so strong a North country dialect that when he first rose in the House of Commons Disraeli is said to have inquired with some curiosity "In what language was that man speaking?" But "his native wood note wild" soon gained recognition as the voice of one of the most eloquent orators of his time. Joseph Cowen was a speaker full of passion and power. But no man ever prepared his speeches so carefully. He not only wrote them out, revised them and committed them to memory, but even went to the length of rehearsing them to a reporter before he delivered them. He once defined his theory of success in public speaking. First he placed knowledge, second style, and third delivery. Of these the first alone is indispensable. You can do without style and you can neglect delivery, but you must know what you are talking about. "If a man knows the facts and has the art of telling them well he is in possession of the key to oratorical success." Cowen loved to illuminate his orations by purple patches which severe critics would have condemned. He knew, no one better, how to let himself go. In one of the most powerful of his perorations he compared himself to Arnold von Winckelried,[28] who made a path to victory by gathering his foemen's spears into his breast. Coming from any other man the simile would have seemed bombastic and egotistic. Such was the rush and the glamour of Cowen's rugged eloquence that it seemed almost as if he were transfigured for the moment with the likeness of the Swiss patriot martyr.

Mr Bright by common consent was the greatest orator of the last half century. Unlike Joseph Cowen he cultivated a style of severe simplicity. It was but seldom, and only in his hotter youth, that he ventured upon the daring metaphors which kindled the imagination of his hearers. There was only one such flight for instance as that in which Mr Bright stilled the House of Commons by declaring the Angel of Death has been abroad throughout the land.[29] "You may almost hear the beating of his wings." I only once had the privilege of being with Mr Bright when he delivered one of his greatest speeches. It was in 1878 when the friends of peace were making their last desperate rally

Chamberlain and the Liberal Unionists won a decisive victory that inaugurated a twenty-year period of rule by the Tories and their various allies.

27 Sir Joseph Cowen (1831-1900), orator, politician, journalist, and long-time friend of Stead who exercised his great gifts of eloquence in behalf of such advanced ideas of democracy as Chartism. As a member of Parliament for Newcastle-on-Tyne after 1874, Cowen broke with Stead over the latter's pro-Russian sympathies during the Eastern Crisis of 1876-1878.

28 Arnold von Winkelried, the Unterwalden Swiss, whom tradition credits with having won the day in the battle of Sempach (1386) by gathering into his breast the spears of a multitude of Austrian knights.

29 Bright's famous "Angel of Death" speech on February 23, 1855, during the Crimean War.

against the Russophobists who under Lord Beaconsfield's leadership were leading straight for war.[30] As we sat at tea before going down to the Free Trade Hall in Manchester, I noticed the Great Tribune was nervous and ill at ease. To my attempt to reassure him, he replied gloomily, "You do not remember as I do how men spat in my face when I went down to speak in Manchester against the Crimean War."[31] Fortunately there was no repetition of that brutality. The meeting was a magnificent demonstration against war, and Mr. Bright seldom spoke with more fervour and the inspiration of an ancient seer. Mr Bright denounced the threatened war as the suspension over two continents of the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. "Never" he exclaimed "shall torrents of English blood be made to flow at the command —I do not say the betrayal—of one who has not a drop of English blood in his veins."[32] The effect upon the meeting was tremendous. It had already been stirred up to a high pitch and Mr Bright's closing words let loose an overwhelming tumult of cheers.

The man "without a drop of English blood in his veins" found it prudent to obey the Tribune's bidding and to evade the war he had courted by the transparent device of "Peace with Honour."[33]

Mr Disraeli is better remembered because of his initial failure to command the ear of the House of Commons, than by any of his oratorical successes. His epigrams are smart but hardly oratorical.[34] When he crossed swords with Mr Gladstone in the last great tourney over the Bulgarian atrocities, and Berlin treaty,[35] the vehemence of his invective was esteemed mighty clever by his party, but they read somewhat absurdly to-day. It is not necessary that the effect of oratory shall be lasting in order to be regarded as oratory. A great orator like a great actor owed his greatness to a quality which perishes in the using.

Among the great mob orators or demagogues of our time, using the term in its best sense, the first place belongs to Mr Gladstone, who is much more than a demagogue, but as a demagogue he was facile princeps. Mr Chamberlain is our greatest living demagogue and he comes nearer the accepted type of demagogue than Mr Gladstone who was always too much of a revivalist preacher anxious to save the souls of his hearers. Lord Randolph [Churchill][36] and his son Winston are both typical demagogues who rose to a high position in the State. Mr Bradlaugh[37] was a demagogue of another sort. More democratic in his fibre, he was a man who lived on the

[30] The agitation of the Liberals and the Russophiles during the Anglo-Russian crisis over the Eastern Question, 1876-1878, in which Stead and his friend Madame Novikov played a prominent part. Joseph O. Baylen, "Madame Olga Novikov, Propagandist," *The American Slavic and East European Review*, X (December, 1951), 260-70ff. On Bright's role in the earlier phase of Beaconsfield's pro-Turk policy during this period, see David Harris, *Britain and the Bulgarian Horrors* (Chicago, 1939), pp. 110, 112, 229, 390-91.

[31] Baylen, *QJS*, XLI, 162.

[32] Although this is a reference to Disraeli's Jewish ancestry, it would be unfair to surmise that either Bright or Stead was anti-semitic.

[33] Beaconsfield's famous statement upon returning to England from the Congress of Berlin with the Treaty of Berlin (1878). R. W. Seton-Watson, *Britain in Europe, 1789-1914* (Cambridge, 1955), pp. 540-41.

[34] See Carroll C. Arnold, "The Speech Style of Benjamin Disraeli," *QJS*, XXXIII (December, 1947), 434-36; and, Bright's estimate of Lord Beaconsfield's oratorical skill in Baylen, *QJS*, XLI, 161.

[35] For a detailed account of the duel between Gladstone and Beaconsfield and a summary of Stead's role during the Eastern Crisis of 1876-1878, see R. W. Seton-Watson, *Disraeli, Gladstone and the Eastern Question* (London, 1935), *passim*.

[36] Lord Randolph Henry Spencer Churchill (1849-1894), British statesman and Conservative politician.

[37] Charles Bradlaugh (1833-1891), social reformer and radical member of Parliament.

platform, and for many years made his living lecturing.

The most eloquent of European orators to-day is probably Count Apponyi[38] the Hungarian Minister of Education whose splendid speech at the Interparliamentary Union[39] Banquet in Westminster Hall will never be forgotten by those who heard it. The handsome presence of the speaker, his tall graceful figure, his earnest delivery and pleasing smile all enable him to achieve supreme success in oratory which has been defined as the art of clothing thoughts in agreeable forms so as to produce persuasion, excite feelings, and communicate pleasure. He was followed by Mr W. J. Bryan whose earnest and eloquent plea for peace based upon a higher conception of the value of a single life enabled the representatives of a score of parliaments to understand somewhat of the magnetism which has so often enthralled American audiences and promises to bring Mr Bryan once more to the steps of the White House.

Twenty years ago Señor Castelar[40] would have carried off for Spain the palm of supreme oratorical genius. In France Mr Gambetta[41] for ten years reigned supreme by virtue of his eloquence. Kossuth[42] fifty years ago made the Crimean War inevitable by the kindling fury of his eloquent denunciations of Russia. He did not foresee the day now fully arrived when Russia instead of being the Citadel of despotism is the nursing mother of the Revolution.

Few things impressed me more during my visit in Russia last autumn[43] than to discover that the Russians were much more eloquent of public speech than the English. The Russian peasant is trained to public speech in the Mir or Commune. Some of the Russian peasants whom I heard discourse left far behind all other mortals for volubility and loquacity. The Douma has produced many eloquent orators among whom M. Rodicheff of Twer[44] is probably the most fiery and rhetorical. The average level of speaking in Russia seemed to me distinctly higher than the standard that prevails in our own country.

The faculty of effective speech is not always combined with great oratorical capacity. The most forcible speaker of our time was probably Prince Bismarck. But he was as little of an orator as Oliver Cromwell whose speeches also made an abiding mark in the history of mankind. Abraham Lincoln was a ready speaker but few have claimed him as an orator, were it not for his Gettysburg oration which is probably the one classic piece of spoken English that will survive to represent the oratorical genius of the Nineteenth century. In this quality of possessing a capacity to say things and of improving upon an acquaintance there is a certain parallel between

38 Count Albert Georg Apponyi (1846-1933), distinguished Magyar magnate, statesman, and parliamentarian.

39 An international association of parliamentarians whose periodic conferences contributed to the elucidation and growth of international law.

40 Emilio Castelar y Ripoli (1832-1899), Spanish statesman who was active in the turbulent political life of the shortlived Spanish federal republic (1873-1874).

41 Léon Gambetta (1838-1882), French statesman and orator who dominated the Republicans during the decade after the Treaty of Frankfort (1871).

42 Louis Kossuth (1802-1894), Magyar patriot and statesman, who, after the collapse of the Hungarian Republic in 1849, made a triumphant tour of England and the United States.

43 On Stead's visit to Russia from August to October, 1905, see Whyte, II, 271-78ff.

44 Feodor I. Rodichev (1854-1933), Liberal politician and leader of the Zemstvo of Tver. During the Revolution of 1905, Rodichev achieved prominence as an outstanding spokesman of the Constitutional Democrat party (*Kadets*) in the first Duma. V. I. Gurko, *Features and Figures of the Past* (Stanford, 1939), p. 602.

Lincoln and the present Prime Minister of Great Britain. The ascendancy which Lincoln in a single year gained over his Cabinet and over the country, has been paralleled by the unexpected ascendancy established in the same period by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman[45] over his Cabinet and the House of Commons. Sir Henry like Uncle Abe has a merry vein of humour, and a capacity for saying things which are not soon forgotten. But no one ventured to believe that he would rise to the height which he now occupies, and would wield the unquestioned authority which he now possesses both at home and abroad. He is not an orator but for capacity to pack plain common sense into a pungent phrase he has few rivals.

As a master of the spoken word for the persuading of men Mr Gladstone stood first among his contemporaries. There was in him a potent magnetic power by which he mesmerized those upon whom he turned his eagle eye. His marvelous voice was like an organ on which he played at will, and thousands throbbed responsive to its faintest note. No sentence was too long or too involved not to seem lucid and clear as it fell from his lips. His stately form, his dignified gesture, and above all the consuming earnestness with which he spoke made him the undisputed master of the multitude.[46] He was a great debater although somewhat too much given to dialectics and hairsplitting, but as a demagogue or platform orator he was unequalled. Never can I forget the first time I ever heard him. It was on Blackheath Common in the early autumn of 1876.[47] He had summoned his constituents to listen to his impeachment of the Sultan for the atrocities perpetrated in Bulgaria. It was a wet day but the people came in their thousands and were rewarded by one of the most overwhelming indictments of tyranny that ever fell from human lips.

But I must draw to a close this discursive gossip about the art of speaking and the great speakers whom I have heard with one or two practical words of advice based upon considerable experience as a speaker and still more as a listener.

(1) Never speak without having something to say.

(2) Always sit down when you [have] said it.

(3) Remember speech is dumb show when it is not audible.

(4) Think definitely, pronounce clearly, stand naturally and do not speak too fast.

(5) Welcome articulate interruption no matter how hostile.

(6) Two things should never be lost, your temper and the thread of your discourse.

[45] Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman (1836-1908). Scotch Liberal statesman and Prime Minister (1905-1908). Whyte, II, 198, 279-80.

[46] W. T. Stead, *Gladstone, 1809-1898. A Character Sketch* (London, 1898), p. 16. See also Professor Loren Reid's edition of "Gladstone's Essay on Public Speaking," *QJS*, XXXIX (October, 1953), 265-72; Philip Magnus, *Gladstone. A Biography* (London, 1954), pp. 48-49, 91, 165-66, 260-61, 265.

[47] On Gladstone's "eminently moderate speech" to his constituents at Blackheath on September 9, 1876, see Harris, pp. 250-51; Seton-Watson, *The Eastern Question*, pp. 76-77. Stead, who was at the time the young editor of the *Darlington Northern Echo* and one of the main actors of the "Horrors" agitation in northern England, made a special journey to hear Gladstone. On Stead's description of the meeting, see Estelle W. Stead, *My Father. Personal and Spiritual Reminiscences* (London, 1913), pp. 63-71.

SHERIDAN'S MAIDEN SPEECH: INDICTMENT BY ANECDOTE

Jerome B. Landfield

WHEN the new Parliament convened in 1780, London political circles watched with special curiosity two freshman members who sat with the opposition: the younger William Pitt and Richard Brinsley Sheridan. While both were well-known because of their families, Sheridan had already achieved fame on his own as a wit, theater manager, and playwright. Nor was there any mystery about his political affiliations, for he was both friend and protégé of Charles James Fox.

The ordeal of the maiden speech was especially formidable for Sheridan and Pitt, for they had to demonstrate oratorical proficiency before an unusually curious and expectant audience. When the trials came, Pitt overshadowed Sheridan, making "the best *first* speech" that Lord North, at least, had ever heard;[1] on the other hand, Sheridan's has often been set down as an unsuccessful maiden speech.

Need we continue to classify Sheridan with the group of illustrious writers who delivered inconsequential first speeches in Parliament? Addison, Bulwer-Lytton, and John Stuart Mill spoke infrequently and ineffectively, and accomplished little in the House. Steele was shouted down during his maiden speech with cries of "Tatler, Tatler," and remarks like "He fancies, because he can scribble. . . ."[2] Gibbon, while bravely writing iconoclastic history, was too frightened to speak before Parliament. He had company, though, for others never spoke and most of the members spoke very little.[3] Erskine, accustomed to deference in the courts, nearly disintegrated before general indifference and Pitt's ostentatious contempt. Sheridan later quipped, "I'll tell you how it happens, Erskine, you are *afraid* of Pitt and that is the flabby part of your character."[4] Macaulay improved after an unceremonious beginning. Disraeli was cut short but not cowed by overt rudeness; he defiantly told the members that some day they would hear him out, and before long they did. Listening politely to a new speaker is relatively recent parliamentary decorum. The parliamentary audience has long had the capacity to be rude, it has been eager to rattle a speaker, and it has been ever ready to display, if motivated, "a healthy and unconcealed intolerance of bores."[5]

Mr. Landfield (M.A., Stanford, 1950) has served as instructor in dramatic art at the University of California at Davis and has recently spent a year as a professional actor. He presented this paper at the convention of the SAA in Los Angeles in 1955.

[1] Horace Walpole, *Journal of the Reign of King George the Third from the Year 1771-1783*, ed. Dr. Doran (London, 1859), II, 446.

[2] Mentioned by Lord John Russell, who attributed this harsh treatment to general antipathy against the Whigs and "the natural envy of mankind, long ago remarked by Cicero, towards all who attempt to gain more than one kind of pre-eminence." Quoted by Thomas Moore, *Memoirs of the Life of the Right Honourable Richard Brinsley Sheridan* (London, 1825), I, 368.

[3] See Loren Reid, "Speaking in the Eighteenth Century House of Commons," *SM* (1949), 135-143, for a discussion of speakers and conditions confronting them.

[4] Quoted by C. A. Goodrich, *Select British Eloquence* (1852), pp. 633-34.

[5] Quotation from W. Fraser Rae, *Sheridan, A Biography* (London, 1896), I, 360; see also Reid, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

Certain sources undeniably substantiate the view that Sheridan failed to impress with his maiden speech. A reputable chronicler like Walpole observed that he "did not make the figure expected."[6] The Margravine of Anspach reportedly echoed a similar sentiment.[7] Sheridan's background caused adverse comment, for many believed, "perhaps very illiberally, that a member of the Legislature should not be the conductor of a public theatre."[8] According to one report, even his manner of speaking was distracting, because of "a thick and indistinct mode of delivery, which, though he afterwards greatly corrected it, was never entirely removed."[9]

An anecdote relating a conversation between Sheridan and Woodfall, the parliamentary reporter, has often been considered as principal evidence that the speech was not successful. When he had finished the speech, so the story goes, Sheridan went to the gallery and asked Woodfall's opinion.

> The answer of Woodfall, as he had the courage afterwards to own, was "I am sorry to say I do not think that this is your line—you had much better have stuck to your former pursuits." On hearing which, Sheridan rested his head upon his hand for a few minutes, and then vehemently exclaimed, "It is in me, however, and, by G——, it shall come out."[10]

The story, along with the implication that the speech was a failure, first appeared in Moore's biography, published a few years after Sheridan's death.[11] Subsequent biographers up to the present time have tended to accept the anecdote along with Moore's judgment.[12] Goodrich contributed to the prevailing attitude by amplifying the interpretation, writing that contemporaries were disappointed, and that Sheridan, "quickened by a sense of shame," applied himself more industriously afterward.[13]

Although some people expressed disappointment at Sheridan's speech, others thought he did quite well. After he had finished, Rigby, Paymaster of the Forces, one of the last politicians in the House to have a kind word for the opposition, prefaced his caustic attack on Sheridan by "seriously acknowledging the force of the hon. gentleman's argument," granting that Sheridan spoke "feelingly upon the subject, and he doubted not, with reason."[14] A suggestion that Sheridan spoke impressively from the very beginning was made by the historian Robert Bisset before Moore published the anecdote:

> Mr. Sheridan, after far surpassing all contemporary writers, and indeed all of the eighteenth century, in comic poetry, *first exhibited in the senate* that strong, brilliant, and

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 432.

[7] "Sheridan's talents," she said, "did not at first engage the attention of the House of Commons so much as might be expected." *Sheridaniana; or, Anecdotes of the Life of Richard Brinsley Sheridan, his Table-talk, Bon-mots* (London, 1826), pp. 81-82.

[8] *The Historical and Posthumous Memoirs of Sir Nathaniel William Wraxall*, ed. Henry B. Wheatley (London, 1884), II, 51.

[9] Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 349.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 348.

[11] The first complete biography of Sheridan does not mention the anecdote: John Watkins, *Memoirs of the Public and Private Life of the Right Honourable R. B. Sheridan* (London, 1817).

[12] Walter Sichel, Sheridan's most thorough and fair-minded biographer, accepts the anecdote with slight reservations, but conjectures without explanation that it applies to a later speech: *Sheridan* (London, 1909), II, 12, including fn. 2. The most influential of modern studies, erudite though disparaging, accepts it without question: R. Crompton Rhodes, *Harlequin Sheridan, the Man and the Legends* (Oxford, 1933), p. 91. This view is also held by the Irish poet-playwright Padraic Colum, "Re-Valuing Richard Brinsley Sheridan," *Dublin Magazine*, New Series, XV (1936), 7. The questionings of the two following biographers have been disregarded, probably because of their enthusiastic sympathies for Sheridan. William Earle suggests that the story might not be authentic: *Sheridan and His Times. By an Octogenarian, who Stood by His Knee in Youth and Sat at His Table in Manhood* (London, 1859), I, 253-54. Rae offers little evidence for his sweeping rejection: *op. cit.*, p. 359 *et seq.*

[13] *Op. cit.*, p. 400.

[14] *Parliamentary History*, XXI, 872.

versatile genius, which had acquired the dramatic palm merely because its possessor had chosen that species of intellectual exercise.[15]

The *Parliamentary History* states that Sheridan "was heard with particular attention, the House being uncommonly still while he was speaking."[16] The fact that Sheridan's audience was "uncommonly" attentive indicates that they were sufficiently interested either in the man, or in what he had to say, or both, that they did not interrupt him. His completing the speech unscathed under trying conditions offers grounds, according to one biographer, for terming it a success.[17]

Others were forced to confront the hostility of political enemies when they spoke; however, few had to labor under such a personal obstacle as Sheridan, for many gentlemen in the House were disdainful of his theatrical background. The son of Lord Holland might strut confidently through his maiden speech, and the son of the great Chatham might anticipate respectful attention, but the son of Thomas Sheridan, the Irish actor, could not expect deference.[18] Winning a hearing was in itself an accomplishment Sheridan shared with other great figures:

> To understand the reasons why talented men sat through session after session without speaking enables the critic to paint a surer picture of the intellectual ruggedness, the moral courage, and the political steadfastness of their great contemporaries, Burke, Fox, and the Pitts.[19]

However, these favorable reports and sympathetic assumptions regarding Sheridan's first speech in Parliament are no more conclusive than the adverse comments. In fact, the Woodfall anecdote tends to give the edge to the unfavorable viewpoint. Consequently as evidence this story has assumed more importance than it deserves. Let us now consider its authenticity.

An early biographer considers the story incompatible with the respective characters of Sheridan and Woodfall.[20] Another has pointed out how the "tale was told to Moore by a Mr. Joy, who said that he had it from Woodfall, and this Woodfall is supposed by Moore to have been the conductor of *The Morning Chronicle*."[21] Moore's source of information can be traced through an entry in his *Journal*, dated January 8, 1819.[22] The entire incident is based on what Sheridan told a man who told a man who told a man who wrote it down nearly forty years later. At least one contemporary has suspected in Woodfall a tendency to put pithy words in Sheridan's mouth.[23] The veracity of Moore's report also seems open to question, since

[15] *The History of the Reign of George III* (London, 1820), III, 99. The italics are mine.

[16] *Op. cit.*

[17] See Rae, *op. cit.*

[18] Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 363, discusses some of the obstacles faced by Sheridan, and notes, "the son of an actor and proprietor of a theatre had, it must be owned, the most fearful odds against him, in entering into competition with the sons of Lord Holland and Lord Chatham."

[19] Reid, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

[20] Earle, *op. cit.*

[21] Rae, *op. cit.*, p. 359, fn. 2.

[22] "Mr. Joy mentioned that Woodfall (I suppose, of the 'Chronicle') told him that he was in the House the first night that Sheridan spoke; and that, after the speech, S. came up to the gallery to him and asked him with much anxiety what he thought of his success. Woodfall answered, 'I think this not your line; no, Sheridan, you had better stick to those pursuits you are so much more fitted for.' Upon which S., after leaning his forehead upon his hand for a few seconds, exclaimed, 'It is *in* me, and, by God, it shall come out.'" *Memoirs, Journal, and Correspondence of Thomas Moore*, ed. Lord John Russell (London, 1853), II, 251.

[23] Daniel Pulteney, for instance, wrote the Duke of Rutland on March 19, 1787, concerning a speech by Sheridan, "nor did he say one half the nonsense Mr. Woodfall has made him say on that subject; but the case is that Mr. Sheridan is so connected with all these reporters as Manager, and Secretary to the Treasury, and author, that they are always determined to make him *pointed*, as they call it, in reply, and when they do not understand what he says, they give him any abuse of their own." *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Fourteenth Report, Appendix, Part I, Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland, K. G., Preserved at Belvoir Castle* (London, 1894), III, 379.

it passed through more than one imagination over so long a time. Moore altered the story a little when he published it six years later in his biography: Woodfall's dialogue is more succinct and his grammar cleaner, while Sheridan waits minutes instead of seconds, then bursts out "vehemently" rather than merely exclaiming that he had it in him. If one man can make such alterations after six years, three men in forty years could mutilate the tale beyond recognition. One might question whether Sheridan, after concluding this important event, would desert colleagues like Fox and Burke to dash up to the gallery to get the opinion of a reporter; and one may doubt that when he heard the dictum, this young man, vigorous and famous for his quick wit, would have to pause seconds or minutes before he could manage to reply.

Like most rumors and historical anecdotes, the story must have had some basis in truth. Sheridan, like Burke, might have been highly critical of his own effort and reluctant to grant that he gave a commendable maiden speech; or, since he was accustomed to public adulation, he might have expected more praise than the occasion could ever have warranted. He might have forgotten for a moment that he had been forced to give a serious speech, devoid of any opportunity to display his powers of wit and ornament.

The circumstances surrounding the occasion serve to explain why Sheridan could not deliver the traditional maiden speech. He could not choose his subject and he had to speak right away, just three weeks after he entered Parliament. Richard Whitworth, the defeated candidate, had petitioned the House, accusing Sheridan and his co-candidate Moncton of corrupt election practices. Whitworth had to present supporting evidence within a year or the charge would be dropped. Behind Whitworth's action further political hostility was evident, for the ministry was attempting to keep Sheridan out of Parliament. A year later, when the legal time limit had expired, Mrs. Sheridan wrote her husband's sister:

> You will no doubt rejoice with us on Dick's triumph over the Ministry. All their efforts to procure a petition against him have been overthrown by his spirited exertions and he had the satisfaction of bringing himself the intelligence of their ill success to the House of Commons on the last day of receiving petitions, when they were all waiting in expectation of its coming—so that is one cloud removed which has for some time hung over his head.[24]

If Sheridan had replied in detail to Whitworth's ministry-inspired accusation, he would have given credence to the complaint, providing rhetorical ammunition for his enemies and allowing himself to be baited. But if he had waited for a more opportune occasion to give his maiden speech, his silence at this time might have aroused suspicion. Since his defeated opponent was bold enough to question his integrity, the man who was famous for fighting two duels decided that a few words in his own behalf were in order.

On November 20, 1780, Sheridan delivered the speech, a terse, straightforward effort, free from the impassioned oratory, the figurative language, the wit and ridicule characteristic of his later speeches. He did not defend his own actions; he questioned the motives of his accusers. In substance, he declared that those who mock-seriously present such grave charges should be punished; Whitworth's accusation was "a gross and groundless libel" on his Stafford constituents.[25] Maintaining a tone of dignity

[24] Quoted by Sichel, *op. cit.*, p. 391.
[25] *Parliamentary History*, XXI, 871-72.

and reserve throughout, he avoided a bickering self-defense, personal references, and cultivated buffoonery. With noticeable modesty he twice admitted that his audience was more experienced than he, twice urging them to consider proper punishment for persons making unfounded charges for questionable reasons. He concluded the address with the latter of these two requests:

> He therefore hoped that some gentlemen of more experience than himself would turn their thoughts towards providing some just and adequate remedy for this evil, and some exemplary penalties, whenever charges of so gross a nature are preferred on frivolous grounds, and with unfair purposes.[26]

When Sheridan had finished, only Rigby was abusive, first, as we have seen, granting some validity in the speech, and then reverting to his usual manner of "coarse, contemptuous and insulting ridicule."[27] Fox vigorously defended Sheridan; and the short controversy was ended by the Speaker's declaration that there was no question before the House. By that time, hardly anyone seriously thought Sheridan had used corrupt means to get elected, though standard practice then would not be openly condoned today.[28]

If, in his maiden speech, the political neophyte is supposed to impress listeners with his oratorical ability, then by this criterion Sheridan's first effort cannot be termed truly successful. This shortcoming was emphasized with Sheridan because his potentialities were unmistakable: his appearance was imposing, and he was famous for personal charm, vigor, wit, and literary deftness. Consequently many were undeniably disappointed when he did not burst forth with a gem of eloquence. Such a capacity was indeed within him, and it did come out in 1787 with his famous speech against Warren Hastings. But when we consider the criteria for speechmaking in general, such as achievement of purpose, it is then that his initial address gains stature.

Sheridan's immediate goal was to convince the honestly suspicious members of the House that his behavior during the election had been beyond reproach. His method was to show that Whitworth's charge was groundless, by questioning the motives of his accuser, at the same time maintaining dignity by avoiding a direct self-defense. Suspicions in the House must have been allayed, for no action was taken to investigate the charges; there was no Stafford equivalent of a Westminster Scrutiny. Whitworth failed to press the charges within the year's time limit. If Whitworth had no substantiating evidence, then why did he make the charge in the first place? He was probably encouraged in the hope that such a harassing move might have some chance of succeeding. Since Sheridan's maiden speech is his primary refutation of the accusations, then the speech significantly contributed to his successful rejection of attempts to discredit him and cause his removal from Parliament.

Sheridan also had a more subtle and distant objective in mind: to win the respect of his colleagues, and to earn from them the right to be a member of the House. He could not accomplish

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 872.

[27] Rae, *op. cit.*, p. 358, quoting Wraxall. The *Parliamentary History* also noted Rigby's sarcasm.

[28] Sheridan had an election expense of £1000 in 1780, and in 1784 his costs included "248 burgesses paid £5 5s. each . . . £1,302.0.0." See Rhodes, *op. cit.*, p. 91, who considers Sheridan corrupt. The normalcy of such expenditures is indicated by Lord Mornington's letter to the Marquis of Buckingham, November 15, 1788: "I think it certain, that Pitt, in any event, will have two seats at that place [Grimsby] at the general election for about £5000." See Duke of Buckingham, *Memoirs of the Court and Cabinets of George the Third* (London, 1853), I, 456.

this in one speech, for there were too many prejudices to break down. He avoided rhetorical exhibitionism by speaking with modesty and restraint, at the dubious expense of disappointing those who wanted entertainment. He consciously set the tone of his beginning speeches. Moore noted the pattern:

> . . . whenever he did speak, it was concisely and unpretendingly, with the manner of a person who came to learn a new road to fame,—not of one who laid claim to notice upon the credit of the glory he brought with him. Mr. Fox used to say that he considered his conduct in this respect as a most striking proof of his sagacity and good taste;—such rare and unassuming displays of his talents being the only effectual mode he could have adopted, to win on the attention of his audience and gradually establish himself in their favor.[29]

Sheridan soon became a highly regarded member of his party; within two years he was a ministry official, appointed Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs in the Rockingham government.

It is quite possible, then, that Sheridan accomplished exactly what he intended with his maiden speech, and achieved success where he might have met disaster, the Woodfall anecdote notwithstanding. Sheridan, of course, may have gone to the gallery when he finished speaking and may have asked Woodfall's opinion. Woodfall perhaps told him that he was better as a playwright. Sheridan may have been disappointed at not eliciting a more enthusiastic response, and perhaps expressed a determination to improve his speaking. But I think it is a mistake to infer from this anecdote that the speech, according to Sheridan's own admission, was a failure. This experienced playwright and theater manager knew how to communicate with an audience, and he was gifted enough to do it well.

[29] Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 362.

THE PRIVILEGED MOMENT: A STUDY IN THE RHETORIC OF THOMAS WOLFE

Maurice Natanson

Every language is the whole of a world, a space in which our souls live and move. Each word breathes the air of the whole. Each is open toward an unbounded horizon. A language is not an aggregate of words and rules. It is a potential world, an infinity of past and future worlds, merely a frame within which we speak and can create our world, actualizing ourselves and our language.

—*Kurt Riezler*

I

THE rhetoric of Thomas Wolfe is part of his legend.[1] Building a fury of signs, he elevated words and sounds to an intensity which is qualitatively their own and unique to his style; protean and boundless, he urged language into a wildness and power that signalized his transcendent view of the world as a labyrinth of the lonely and the alone. Wolfe's style, then, is as striking as his great figure must have been; and there is no critic of his work who has failed to remark its reach and also its problematics.[2] But as with so many other features of the Wolfe legend, there has been more mention of his rhetoric than there has been serious analysis of it.[3] Somehow it has been taken for granted for the very reason of its immediacy. That much has been lost in this way I hope to show; but the present essay cannot claim to be a study of Wolfe's style or an anatomy of his language. Rather, I am here concerned with his rhetoric as a single, though crucial, facet of a phenomenology of language, a facet which will, however, lead to nuclear issues in rhetorical theory.

Although it is not within the scope of this essay to consider the problems of a phenomenology of language or the more general philosophical issues involved in clarifying the relationship of language to reality, I do wish to indicate the immediate sense in which I am using the term "rhetoric" in the present discussion. Negatively stated, I am not interested here in anything that can be called traditional rhetoric, i.e., the history of rhetoric in Greek and Roman thought, nor am I concerned with recent discus-

Maurice Natanson (Ph.D., Nebraska, 1950, D.S.Sc., Graduate Faculty, New School for Social Research, 1953) is Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Houston. American Council of Learned Societies Scholar 1951-53, he is the author of A Critique of Jean-Paul Sartre's Ontology *and* The Social Dynamics of George H. Mead.

[1] See Herbert J. Muller, *Thomas Wolfe* (Norfolk, Connecticut, 1947), Chapter 1.

[2] For a sympathetic treatment of Wolfe's style, see Pamela Hansford Johnson, *Thomas Wolfe: A Critical Study* (London and Toronto, 1947), pp. 17-33; the case against Wolfe is presented by Alfred Kazin, *On Native Grounds* (New York, 1942), Chapter 15. Kazin writes (p. 480): "Wolfe was the Tarzan of rhetoric, the noble lover, the antagonist of cities, the spear of fate, the Wolfe whose rhetoric, swollen with archaisms out of the English classics, can be as painful to read as a child's scrawlings. His rhetoric, pilfered recklessly from the Jacobeans and Sir Thomas Browne, James Joyce and Swinburne, Gilbert Murray and the worst traditions of Southern oratory, was a gluttonous English instructor's accumulation. He became enraptured with the altitudinous, ceremonial prose of the seventeenth century, with the vague splendors of a dozen assorted romanticisms, and united them at the pitch of his father's mountain oratory."

[3] There is no title on Wolfe's rhetoric contained in the bibliography of the secondary literature which appears in Thomas Clark Pollock and Oscar Cargill, *Thomas Wolfe at Washington Square* (New York, 1954), nor is there any article specifically concerned with Wolfe's style included in *The Enigma of Thomas Wolfe*, ed. Richard Walser (Cambridge, Mass., 1953).

sions of the status of theory of rhetoric.[4] Furthermore, I am not talking about anything which has been discussed under the rubric of rhetorical criticism or poetic. Although the style of my problem may be closest to the spirit of the "New Rhetoric," I have developed my ideas from distinctively philosophical considerations and from a particular philosophical tradition that are not proper parts of the "New Rhetoric." Positively stated, I have used "rhetoric" as an inroad to the philosophical problem of how language both fixes and realizes the complex "moments" of meaning which announce reality. Rhetoric here is developed, however, within and through the context of Wolfe's writings rather than in philosophical terms. I have started with the naive sense of rhetoric which has been used to characterize a distinctive aspect of Wolfe's style, but my point is that this sense of rhetoric as high-flown, charged, and rhapsodic usage is a clue to a profound dimension of language which has been obscured or ignored—the power of language to epiphanize transcendent meanings through its own instrumentality. The rationale of such a concept of rhetoric, the analysis of its structure, is the task of a phenomenology of language which would account for and describe the logical genesis and foundation of meaning in subjectivity. The philosophical achievement of Edmund Husserl has given us the groundwork for such an investigation. Alfred Schutz' "Symbol, Reality, and Society"[5] is a decisive contribution to recent discussion of these problems. But such phenomenological investigations of language and reality are beyond the limits of my remarks on Wolfe. Here I wish to restrict the problem to exactly what I have attempted: interpreting the rhetoric of Thomas Wolfe as the articulation of reality through privileged moments.

Our first problem is one of definition. Traditionally, by the rhetoric of Thomas Wolfe has been meant his charged language, those extensive passages throughout his works which are stylistically reminiscent of Whitman and Melville and which bear the fiery and solemn cadences of the Old Testament.[6]

> Who has seen fury riding in the mountains? [Wolfe writes]. Who has known fury striding in the storm? Who has been mad with fury in his youth, given no rest or peace or certitude by fury, driven on across the earth by fury, until the great vine of the heart was broke, the sinews wrenched, the little tenement of bone, marrow, brain, and feeling in which great fury raged, was twisted, wrung, worn out, and exhausted by the fury which it could not lose or put away? Who has known fury, how it came?[7]

Such passages appear in at least two ways in the novels: they are interspersed, usually following scenes or vignettes, and serve as a kind of chorus for the works; also they are binding and bridging structures which function as motifs at the beginning of each novel, as connective tissue between sections, and as poetic finales.

As a chorus, Wolfe's chanting voice takes up again and again the central themes of his work: the self in its solitude and lostness in reality, the self in

[4] E.g.: My article, "The Limits of Rhetoric," *QJS*, XLI (April 1955), is completely unrelated to the present essay, apart from the identity of philosophical standpoint underlying both papers.

[5] In *Symbols and Society: Fourteenth Symposium of the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion*, ed. Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelstein, Hudson Hoagland, R. M. Maciver (New York, 1955).

[6] Two collections of rhetorical-poetic passages from the writings of Wolfe have appeared: John Hall Wheelock, *The Face of a Nation* (New York, 1939) and John S. Barnes, *A Stone, A Leaf, A Door* (New York, 1945).

[7] *Of Time and the River* (New York, 1944), pp. 27-28.

the image of Telemachus, the self's rootedness in earth, history, and the prime memories of family and home, and, finally, the voyage of the self in search of itself through the mysteries of time and the haunting domain of death. Suffusing these passages is a sense of root loss, an *a priori* of something sought for and somewhere missed, as though what structures human experience into the relatedness of men were itself flawed—not failure here but the impossibility of fulfillment:

> Which of us has known his brother? Which of us has looked into his father's heart? Which of us has not remained forever prison-pent? Which of us is not forever a stranger and alone?[8]

As binding and bridging forces, such expressive passages are distillations of things done, places seen, persons encountered, and experiences suffered and reveled in. The connections are both immediate and indirect: they lead from one set of affairs to another in the novelist's story and they also thrust back and forth in the substance of events. Throughout *Of Time and the River*, for example, the image and theme of death is taken up in manifold ways—the deaths of the hero's father and brother are the points of central reference—and returned to through the instrument of rhetorical passages. Immediately after a comic interlude in the novel, Wolfe turns to the theme of his brother's death and resurrects his image:

> And then he would hear again the voice of his dead brother, and remember with a sense of black horror, dream-like disbelief, that Ben was dead, and yet could not believe that Ben had ever died, or that he had had a brother, lost a friend. Ben would come back to him in these moments with a blazing and intolerable reality, until he heard his quiet living voice again, saw his fierce scowling eyes of bitter gray, his scornful, proud and lively face, and always when Ben came back to him it was like this: he saw his brother in a single image, in some brief forgotten moment of the past, remembered him by a word, a gesture, a forgotten act; and certainly all that could ever be known of Ben's life was collected in that blazing image of lost time and the forgotten moment. And suddenly he would be there in a strange land, staring upward from his bed in darkness, hearing his brother's voice again, and living in the far and bitter miracle of time.[9]

After this section devoted to Ben, there is an immediate return to the earlier scene. This kind of placement can only be understood as connective ordering which illuminates the themes of a novel by rhetorical emphasis. The connection is direct to the extent that it instantly binds together parts of a single sequence; it is indirect, however, in its very persuasion, for it calls the reader back to fragmented moments of the theme's expression at the same time that it promises a re-sounding and rearticulation in pages to come.

But defining rhetoric in this context as charged language, dominated by poetic image, and having the several stylistic functions just discussed, is far from arriving at an acceptable analysis of the problem. It is my thesis that there is much more involved in the rhetoric of Thomas Wolfe; that we must go beyond the characters of rich, compressed, and pulsating language to the interior and essential meaning born and expressed by the order of prose-poetry commonly associated with Wolfe. I wish to suggest that that meaning lies in a certain attitude toward language itself, a certain appraisal of the limits of language, and a certain refusal to accept those limits—at least not without raging. To put the entire matter in a different way: Wolfe's rhetoric involves a conception of language, its inherent powers and possibilities, and, I would add, its relation-

[8] *Look Homeward, Angel* (New York, 1929), motif, facing p. 3.

[9] *Of Time and the River*, pp. 200-201.

ship to the reality it describes and engages, and to its votaries, like Wolfe, whom it demonizes.

II

For many and divergent reasons, ours may be called the century of language: whether we consider the contributions of philosophers, psychologists, or novelists, the central impression that a new "key" (to use Susanne Langer's term) has been struck in the whole range of knowledge and art is unavoidable and undeniable. In philosophy the work of such variant thinkers as Peirce, Husserl, Cassirer, Heidegger, and Wittgenstein has created a rich literature concerned with the problems of symbol, concept, and form; in psychology (broadly taken) the work of Freud, George H. Mead, the Gestalt school, and Kurt Goldstein has opened up a new terrain of relevances for language in its relationship to mind and action; and in literature, the revolutionary contributions of Proust and Joyce have liberated and made explicit a generative force in art.[10] Even if we restrict ourselves to literary influences, the impact of the century's discovery on the consciousness of Wolfe was enormous. Joyce's influence on Wolfe may serve as an approach to the problem of rhetoric.[11]

Only obliquely in *Ulysses* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, but explicitly in *Stephen Hero*, Joyce formulates his theory of *epiphany*.

> By an epiphany he meant a sudden spiritual manifestation, whether in the vulgarity of speech or of gesture or in a memorable phrase of the mind itself. He believed that it was for the man of letters to record these epiphanies with extreme care, seeing that they themselves are the most delicate and evanescent of moments.[12]

An epiphany is a momentous and instantaneous manifestation of reality; it is a sudden breaking into experience with arterial force, revealing "that which is" with utter truth and candor. The greatness of an artist may be measured by the epiphanies he gives us, those revelations that turn on vast lights in our consciousness, which in searching out their hidden objects, their shadowed forms, search out in us the gift of understanding. Joyce presents his theory in quasi-satiric scholastic terms:

> First we recognize that the object is *one* integral thing, then we recognize that it is an organized composite structure, a *thing* in fact: finally, when the relation of the parts is exquisite, when the parts are adjusted to the special point, we recognize that it is *that* thing which it is. Its soul, its whatness, leaps to us from the vestment of its appearance. The soul of the commonest object, the structure of which is so adjusted, seems to us radiant. The object achieves its epiphany.[13]

An epiphany may be generated out of compounded objects and experiences, however, and the moment of insight and expression goes beyond the Thomistic trinity of "wholeness, harmony, and radiance" which Joyce discusses.[14] An epiphany in the compounded sense,

[10] T. S. Eliot writes of *Ulysses:* "I hold this book to be the most important expression which the present age has found; it is a book to which we are all indebted, and from which none of us can escape." ("Ulysses, Order, and Myth," in *James Joyce: Two Decades of Criticism*, ed. Seon Givens [New York, 1948], p. 198.)

[11] See Thomas Wolfe, *The Story of a Novel* in *The Portable Thomas Wolfe*, ed. Maxwell Geismar (New York, 1946), p. 566 and also cf. Nathan L. Rothman, "Thomas Wolfe and James Joyce: A Study in Literary Influence," in *The Enigma of Thomas Wolfe*.

[12] James Joyce, *Stephen Hero* (A Part of the First Draft of A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man), ed. Theodore Spencer (New York, 1944), p. 211; see Spencer's Introduction, *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17 and cf. Irene Hendry, "Joyce's Epiphanies," in *James Joyce: Two Decades of Criticism* and Harry Levin, *James Joyce: A Critical Introduction* (Norfolk, Connecticut, 1941), pp. 28-31 and *passim*.

[13] *Stephen Hero*, p. 213.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 212-213 and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in *The Portable James Joyce*, ed. Harry Levin (New York, 1947), p. 478 ff.

generalized into the total world of experience, is the discovery of a thematic meaning which has been lost in its "sedimentations" (to borrow a term from the language of phenomenology), which has encysted in its complexity within experience, but below the threshold of explicit awareness. It is this distillation of meanings which is tapped by creative genius and brought to expression in epiphany. And, I would suggest, it is precisely the stylistic methodology of Joyce that recommends itself to Wolfe, for he too is haunted by epiphanies potential to creation, awaiting the season of their unfolding.

If the epiphanies of Joyce are revelations of Man, they are for Wolfe outpourings of the person, the self alone; yet the starting point, stylistically, is historical for both. Just as *Ulysses* is the exploration of consciousness through the single day of Leopold Bloom, a moment in time, so, it may be remarked, the novels of Wolfe begin with a dating of the action or a statement of the historicity of the theme.[15] The beginning of *Look Homeward, Angel* is the clearest announcement of Wolfe's intentions: the prologue of the first chapter presents a colon to which the totality of the rest of the novel is a restricted, implicit remainder:

> Each of us [Wolfe writes] is all the sums he has not counted: subtract us into nakedness and night again, and you shall see begin in Crete four thousand years ago the love that ended yesterday in Texas.
>
> The seed of our destruction will blossom in the desert, the alexin of our cure grows by a mountain rock, and our lives are haunted by a Georgia slattern, because a London cutpurse went unhung. Each moment is the fruit of forty thousand years. The minute-winning days, like flies, buzz home to death, and every moment is a window on all time.
>
> This is a moment:[16]

Each person, each event, each history of affairs is a compressed cipher for which Wolfe's art is hermeneutic. The world of each man is a microcosm in which is pressured the totality of all that ever was, implied in an almost Hegelian trail of connections that return the moment to Time, the event to Process, the individual to the Absolute. Wolfe's world is a world of moments, highly structured and individuated, yet caught up in the themes of a mutual destiny, a single attraction that gives them valence and defines their signification.

The placement of meaning and insight in the moment is inescapable to any reader of the novels: the stranger seen in the street, on the train, from afar, glimpsed for that instant of recognition and then forever vanished back into the web of anonymity, the face at the window, the brief look of the bank teller, the sight of the salesman, the suddenly-caught movement of the laborer, the craftsman, the stitch of the tailor, the trucker shifting heavy gears, the frosty face of the trainsman signalling in an early hour of winter, the soft cry of a child—all these are familiar moments in the pages of the novels, and Wolfe is unimaginable without them. But these moments are usually described as "far and lost," as instantly gone, as "forever lost." They are instantaneous irruptions in consciousness which fill the hero with sadness and longing and despair and wonder; they are always sudden, always intense, and always remembered. It is in these moments that Wolfe's epiphanies manifest themselves.

But it is necessary to examine these

[15] The opening sentences of *Of Time and the River* and *You Can't Go Home Again* date the action of the novel in terms of the hero; the opening sentence of *The Web and the Rock* and the third paragraph of the opening page of *Look Homeward, Angel* date the action in terms of the hero's ancestors.

[16] *Look Homeward, Angel*, p. 3.

moments most rigorously if we are to go beyond the simple marking of them: what content do they inform us of, what indeed do they epiphanize? In answer to this question one commentator has suggested that the passion of the moment is in its givenness and that the meaning of the moment invariably escapes both novelist and reader.

> Everything for Wolfe is in the moment [writes John Peale Bishop], he can so try to impress us with the immensity of the moment that it will take on some sort of transcendental meaning. But what that meaning is, escapes him, as it does us. And once it has passed from his mind, he can do nothing but recall another moment, which as it descends into his memory seems always about to deliver itself, by a miracle, of some tremendous import.[17]

But Bishop views these moments in an almost moral context: they represent efforts on the part of the novelist to embrace his characters and their truth as well; and since Wolfe, according to this critic, was ultimately incapable of love, those moments fail to achieve resolution: they are mounting crescendos in a symphony that moves, quickens, and elevates without ever coming to climax.

> The most striking passages in Wolfe's novels [Bishop says] always represent these moments of comprehension. For a moment, but a moment only, there is a sudden release of compassion, when some aspect of suffering and bewildered humanity is seized, when the other's emotion is in a timeless completion known. Then the moment passes, and compassion fails.[18]

But I think Wolfe's moments may be viewed apart from Bishop's moral framework, that they do reveal an interior signification, and that though they lapse in the temporal movement of the novel, they remain constant in the articulation of Wolfe's vision. It is as instrumentalities of rhetoric that their import may be grasped and their positive quality seized.

[17] John Peale Bishop, "The Sorrows of Thomas Wolfe," *Kenyon Review*, I (1939), 10-11.
[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

III

Someone has remarked that all Wolfe's novels are about a novelist writing a novel. Whatever truth there may be in this, in addition to surface observation, it may tend to obscure a deeper truth about Wolfe's work: that much of it is self-critical in the sense of being metalinguistic. There are sections of the novels, in addition to *The Story of a Novel*, which are directly concerned with the problems of language and language users, though those sections often take the form of meditations on language and art rather than academic or philosophical critiques. In an epiphanous moment Wolfe presents the bond and power that bind the writer to his art:

> At that instant he saw, in one blaze of light, an image of unutterable conviction, the reason why the artist works and lives and has his being—the reward he seeks—the only reward he really cares about, without which there is nothing. It is to snare the spirits of mankind in nets of magic, to make his life prevail through his creation, to wreak the vision of his life, the rude and painful substance of his own experience, into the congruence of blazing and enchanted images that are themselves the core of life, the essential pattern whence all other things proceed, the kernel of eternity.[19]

The epiphany Wolfe gives us is the revelation of language itself: the artist in words is more than storyteller or technician; he is in possession of the quintessence of existence if only it can be tamed into expression, worked into "the congruence of blazing and enchanted images." Language, for Wolfe, is both battering ram and castle, it is weapon and wound, for the moment's meaning is that language *is* reality, bound to it in the way of its being and in the form of its substance. Wolfe's quest for linguistic dominion is the effort to wrench from language its capacity to penetrate reality, to gain an in-

[19] *Of Time and the River*, p. 550.

road into being, to achieve the miracle of epiphany in which language reveals itself as reality and reality reveals itself through image, form, and the magical terms of language. "Could I," Wolfe cries, "weave into immortal denseness some small brede of words, pluck out of sunken depths the roots of living, some hundred thousand magic words that were as great as all my hunger, and hurl the sum of all my living out upon three hundred pages!"[20] And this cry, itself a moment, is the confession that language is superior to any of its concretizations, that it remains, like earth and the seasons, a quest for the wanderer and a home for the lost.

The moment, then, is revealed in language because its very character is constituted of language: the image of the real *is* the real or as much of it as man can grasp, and language draws us into the vortex of full expression. The points in language when such perfection of meaning and image, of word and reality, is achieved are epiphanies; they are, we may say, *privileged moments* of consciousness. And now the full relationship of rhetoric and language may be seen, for rhetoric, as we choose to interpret it in our present framework, is the complete expression which embodies an epiphany, and makes of it a privileged moment. It is not a question of poetic expression or high-flown language; rather it is the victory of language over its object when form fixes content with purity and high purpose. The fixation intended here is the expression of consciousness divorcing from its interest, momentarily, the irrelevancies which bind us to the meanings sedimented in reality. In this sense, rhetoric liberates consciousness from a burden of connections and opens it up and out into a world of unlimited truth. It re-teaches us how to *see* what is given us in experience; by its very power and elevation it draws us up to face what hitherto in seeing we have always ignored: rhetoric gives to the privileged moment a privileged status. Though his essay is concerned with different problems from those we have been dealing with here, a passage from Camus' *The Myth of Sisyphus* gives a penetrating statement of what we may call the rhetoric of privilege:

> Thinking is learning all over again how to see, directing one's consciousness, making of every image a privileged place. . . . From the evening breeze to this hand on my shoulder, everything has its truth. Consciousness illuminates it by paying attention to it. Consciousness does not form the object of its understanding, it merely focuses, it is the act of attention, and, to borrow a Bergsonian image, it resembles the projector that suddenly focuses on an image. The difference is that there is no scenario, but a successive and incoherent illustration. In that magic lantern all the pictures are privileged. Consciousness suspends in experience the objects of its attention. Through its miracle it isolates them.[21]

Consciousness attains to the privileged moment through its capacity to fix it in symbols, to announce its coherence through the coherence of language itself. In this sense, rhetoric as "fixative" is a special moment, a privileged moment, in linguistic expression, and in the purest form it can attain, it transcends itself into poetry.

If we have presented rhetoric in a rather unusual light, it is no less the case that we have turned to perhaps curious features of language and consciousness itself. The world examined in these terms is hardly the world as it

[20] *The Web and the Rock* (New York, 1937), motif on page preceding p. 3.

[21] Albert Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays* (New York, 1955), p. 43. Note that we are taking this statement out of its context in the essay, considering its meaning for our present discussion quite apart from Camus' interpretation of Edmund Husserl's phenomenology—an interpretation we cannot follow.

is ordinarily regarded. Our excuse, if one is necessary, is that the world as it truly presents itself to human experience is elusive and that the privilege of epiphany commends itself in making substantive to consciousness what otherwise remains tormentingly adjectival. Rhetoric seems, from a theoretical standpoint, to be all things to all men, and we offer here only a little suggestion regarding one possibility of interpretation which we think has been overlooked. However, if what we say about Wolfe's rhetoric is true, we can no longer talk about "mere" rhetoric again. Even at its shallowest, most hollow worst, rhetoric is an instrument capable of a magnificence: as we use it, it may be, but rhetoric itself is never "mere." At its finest, as in the writings of Thomas Wolfe, rhetoric reveals the privileged moment in which human consciousness discovers its passion and power, its capacity to bind up the wound reality inflicts upon those who discover it, and in discovering it, transcend it.

VACATION AT THE BOSTON CONVENTION

For the first time the SAA will hold its annual convention during the summer season—at the Hotel Statler in Boston, August 26 to 29, meeting with AETA, AFA, ASA, NSSC, and NESA. Sixty-four sections have already been arranged by the vice-chairmen of the Interest Groups.

A wide variety of sections is planned providing for the interests of elementary and secondary school teachers; of specialists in speech and hearing disorders, in forensics, and in interpretation; and of those concerned with speech training for foreigners, for religious workers, and for men and women in business and industry. Other sections will feature the processes and results of research in discussion, rhetoric and public address, semantics, and personal and social psychology.

The interest group in radio, TV, and films has planned an examination of curricula in radio and TV, of historical studies, and of educational TV. With the discussion group it will sponsor an actual telecast to be critically examined by the audience.

Again this year SAA will give an informal convention breakfast featuring some of our most entertaining speakers.

ELISE HAHN,
First Vice-President, SAA

THE WORD-SENDER: JOHN G. NEIHARDT AND HIS AUDIENCES

Lucile F. Aly

OLD CHIEF BLACK ELK, the last wise man of the Sioux, once said of John G. Neihardt:

> He is a word-sender. The world is like a garden. Over this garden go his words like rain, and where they fall they make it a little greener. And when his words have passed, the memory of them will stand in the West—like a flaming rainbow.[1]

Black Elk's words may strike a responsive note in hundreds of people from Maine to California who since 1917 have heard Neihardt read his poetry. He has appeared often before university groups and study clubs, but his words have made the world a little greener for businessmen, laborers, housewives, and school children as well.

Although for nearly forty years he has lectured and read to hundreds of audiences, Neihardt has not attached primary importance to his public performances. In his letters he has usually referred to them as "stunts," and, like Robert Frost and Edna St. Vincent Millay, he has looked upon public reading chiefly as a means to a living. During several periods in the years when he was writing his epic *Cycle of the West*, he made lecture tours in order to finance intervals of concentrated writing. The response of his audiences pleased him, at least at first, mainly because it promised well for providing an income.[2] He has modified his attitude in recent years, but writing has always been his first concern.

Nevertheless, Neihardt has been well received as a lecturer-reader. The "sympathetic appreciation" accorded him in a Nebraska town in 1917[3] continued through the twenties. People "swarmed to hear him" in Nebraska;[4] he was gratified when ladies of the Ebell Club in Los Angeles called him back from the wings to read more lyrics,[5] and when Edwin Markham rose after he had read at a reception in New York to say, "I think I have never been more deeply moved than by Neihardt's epic reading. He has done for the prairies what Homer did for Ilium."[6] He was in demand as a lecturer through the thirties and forties; now, at the age of seventy-six, he is still reading his poetry to responsive audiences.

A poet reading his own work is likely to attract the interest of teachers and students of interpretation, for the poet should know best how he wants his poetry to sound. Whether he can convey to a listening audience the poem as he conceived it is another matter, for poets are sometimes not good readers of

Lucile F. Aly (B.S. University of Missouri, 1935; M.A. Teachers College, Columbia University, 1942) is a candidate for the doctorate at the University of Missouri, and is undertaking a dissertation concerning the reading and speaking of John G. Neihardt. Mrs. Aly has served appointments as instructor in English at the University of Missouri and instructor in speech at the University of Hawaii.

[1] Undated clipping from a Wake Forest, North Carolina paper, in the scrapbook kept by Sigurd Neihardt, the poet's son.

[2] Letter from Neihardt to his family, from Wayne, Nebraska, January 27, 1923.

[3] *Peru Normalite*, Peru, Nebraska, Tuesday, October 30, 1917.

[4] *The Goldenrod*, Wayne, Nebraska, July 30, 1923, p. 1.

[5] Letter from Neihardt to his family from Los Angeles, January 14, 1924.

[6] Undated letter from Neihardt to his mother [*c.* December, 1928].

their own work. When, therefore, a poet receives the commendation that Neihardt has been accorded for four decades, his working principles are likely to be worth knowing.

Part of Neihardt's effect on listeners may be attributable to the moving power of the poetry itself; almost any audience might well be expected to respond to the "fiery little lyrics,"[7] the heroic battles, or the tragic death of Crazy Horse. But poetry, however powerful, can be lost in poor reading; some account must be taken of the interpretation.

Neihardt comes to the platform with two natural advantages—a striking appearance and a clear, resonant tenor voice. Despite his slight stature, when he faces an audience he gives no impression of frailty. His body looks wiry and strong—as it is—from hard work in the out-of-doors; he shows, as one interviewer reports, that he has "taken the hard path to get where he is."[8] His sturdy shoulders and "mass of flowing gray hair atop a Homeric head"[9] won him the affectionate name "Little Bull Buffalo" from Indian friends. In his younger days his hair was gold, but its graying has lost him nothing in impressiveness; his "striking appearance of being alive"[10] is unchanged, and the force of his personality explains the impression of a young man who interviewed him and "felt as if [he] spoke to a giant."[11] Neihardt is fortunate also in his rich, vibrant voice, which he uses extremely well. In the early days of his reading-recitals, a more experienced friend gave him the only technical advice he ever had: "sing your vowels and bite your consonants."[12] He took the advice to heart, persisted through a period of conscious effort when friends now and then accused him of affectation, and achieved a flexible, resonant tone and a clear enunciation that have attracted the favorable attention of critics. Neihardt conceives of the reader's voice as almost a singing tone going out to the audience in rhythmic waves; the "singing tone," he believes, not volume, fills a hall.[13]

When he reads, Neihardt prolongs his vowels in stressed words, gives full value to voiced consonants, and tends to cling briefly to nasal sounds. The tone produced has a singing quality that adds dignity to the sweeping rhythm of the lines. Although the poet had no technical training for reading aloud except his youthful practice of shouting poetry into the wind as he walked back roads in Nebraska,[14] he uses well the standard interpretative techniques. He understands thoroughly the value of a pause, and his excellent phrasing also includes the much less common practice of increasing the rate on unimportant words after a pause. In the line, "And there they waited, living, in their grave,"[15] for example, Neihardt lengthens the vowel in *there,* lengthens even more the diphthong in *waited,* makes a full though brief stop, elongates the first vowel in *living,* and pauses again, then speeds up the rate on *in their,* and prolongs the *a* in grave. The combination of lengthened vowels, pauses, and quickened rate on unstressed words lends variety to the fairly long lines. When he reads the

[7] Letter to Neihardt from Louis Untermeyer, September 15, 1913.

[8] Huntington, West Virginia, paper, October 2, 1938.

[9] *St. Louis Globe-Democrat Tempo Magazine,* Sunday, October 22, 1950.

[10] *The Goldenrod,* Wayne, Nebraska, June 26, 1922.

[11] Undated typescript of interview by John Barrow, Jr., Knox College.

[12] This information from lecture at the University of Missouri, April 9, 1956.

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] Interview at University City Junior High School. Tape recorded.

[15] John G. Neihardt, "Song of the Indian Wars," in *A Cycle of the West* (New York, 1949), p. 56.

epics, Neihardt uses a relatively slow rate in keeping with the dignity and force of the story, but he speeds the tempo in action scenes. Many of his effects he achieves through tonal inflection, and he makes full use of the sounds in a line. When he reads that the sky "spat a stinging frost,"[16] he flicks out the sibilants and plosives, and touches the nasal *ng* lightly, to give the sense of cold that stings.

Perhaps Neihardt comprehends the techniques of phrasing, pause, and stress because he has done his work well as a poet. When he was writing the *Cycle of the West* he tested the lines aloud, and labored with great care over every syllable. He knew that the pentameter he had adopted for the epics can easily fall prey to deadly monotony, and he took pains to avoid such misfortune by employing principles he had himself enunciated in 1921.[17] The skill with which he shifted the caesura, and the close attention he gave to sounds within a line as he was writing the epics must have aided him in his oral interpretation. Neihardt's competence as a reader raises provocative questions as to how far the natural method of interpretation may be trusted in the hands of a great poet with a good voice.

Possibly Neihardt's effectiveness as a reader has a further explanation. Although he concedes that voice and technique are important, he is much more concerned with what he calls the "miracle of communication," whether it comes through the written or the spoken word. The poet, he explains, is "increasingly aware of the wonder of things,"[18] and the feeling his wonder gives him is somewhat like the effect of a tonic that has done him so much good he wants to tell others about it. He experiences an urgent desire to share his happiness with them.[19] Neihardt believes that poetry properly presented can reach any audience, and his experiences support his theory; a shaggy old rancher in a "roughneck audience" once pounded the poet's shoulder and growled, "Damn it, you've made me cry!" Neihardt believes that he was able to touch the rancher because he was "crying inside" himself.[20] For perfect communication the reader must earnestly desire to share something important with the listeners, and whether they number three or three hundred, the experienced reader is aware of the exact moment when the audience becomes a unit. Neihardt describes it as almost like a "click" that usually occurs several minutes after the reading begins.[21]

Neihardt's ideas about communication have evolved over the period of his reading career. Acute stagefright made his early readings painful, and only after a long struggle was the poet able to look upon an impending engagement as anything but an ordeal. After the performance he could acknowledge the satisfaction of having acquitted himself well, but forebodings gripped him before each appearance. In the early tours his distress sometimes led him to betray a momentary impatience with the interruption of his real work, as when he wrote to his family, "I don't care much for public stunts. It's neither here nor there except as advertising. Nothing counts but being with one's own and working steadily in one direction."[22] As late as 1921 he wrote, "I'm sick of showing off I can tell you. Most people aren't worth the vitality one wastes on them, tho' certainly I've had fine re-

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 57.
[17] *Laureate Address* of John G. Neihardt (Chicago, 1921), pp. 30, 31.
[18] *Omaha World Herald*, June 1, 1952.
[19] *Ibid.*
[20] Lecture at University of Missouri, April 9, 1956.
[21] *Ibid.*
[22] February 26, 1918.

ception everywhere."[23] The stagefright diminished and the impatience vanished altogether as Neihardt experienced a growing satisfaction in his rapport with audiences. His gratification contained some small element of surprise, as he indicated in 1923 to his family:

I think I held the crowd here as well as anywhere. I got that usual dead silence near the end that I've come to look for. People remarked especially on my voice & my manner of reading. . . . I seem to be a good reader & my voice seems to impress people. These are the last things I used to expect of myself. I did not begin by considering my voice unusual or my reading especially good, but so many insist on this that I'm beginning to believe.[24]

Neihardt's enjoyment of audiences grew in later years; his letters often described a reading experience as a "joy" or "a perfectly bully time"; when he read "The Song of the Messiah" to a student convocation in Indiana, he felt the genuine satisfaction of communicating something worth while. "I felt strong, somehow," he reported; "and until I'm actually talking on the platform, I dislike the idea—would rather be in Slim Buttes."[25] As time went on he learned to feel a real affection for his audiences and a growing desire to share with them his poetic experiences. He found the effort exhausting, but also rewarding. In a comment to his wife he once illuminated this attitude:

I feel very happy when I'm before a crowd, because a sort of tenderness develops in the place, and fills it. But always, when I'm asked to write autographs afterward, I can hardly guide a pen. . . . It isn't as though I felt *any* tenseness or any anxiety. I feel perfectly at ease; but that *stuff* begins pouring out of me—what it is I don't know, but it is powerful and it saps me. Always did.[26]

In the same letter, Neihardt reveals so marked a change in attitude since his early readings that he half considered concentrating on lecture-recitals:

Still I care more for *being* and *saying* than for writing, and perhaps I'll go that way altogether. Something *does* take hold of me & do the talking. It flows so easily and smoothly, and people don't move. Kind of queer, and it makes me feel deeply happy and kind.

Many an audience welded into a unit in the glow of Neihardt's affection has listened spellbound while the poet's "singing tone" took them through dramatic councils, heroic struggles, and the tragic death of noble men. Neihardt may be right that even if the effect is partly hypnotic, the "warm affection" he feels for the people sitting there is real; and when they return it, "perhaps *that* is the real event."[27] Adelbert Jakeman's words, too, may help to define Neihardt's effectiveness; perhaps one feels "taller and braver"[28] after hearing his reading of the epics. The description Neihardt has given of Sitting Bull is apt for the poet himself:

He ceased. As though they heard him speaking still,
The people listened; for he had a way
That seemed to mean much more
than he could say
And over all the village cast a spell.[29]

[23] January 17, 1921.
[24] January 27, 1923.
[25] Letter from Neihardt to his wife, October 17, 1939.
[26] Letter from Blair, Nebraska.
[27] Letter from Neihardt to his family [*c.* 1937].
[28] *Springfield Republican*, Springfield, Massachusetts, October 12, 1941.
[29] "Song of the Indian Wars," in *A Cycle of the West*, p. 340.

THE AREA OF SEMANTICS

John B. Newman

THE phenomenon of semantic change applies to *semantics* itself. Words acquire new meanings and lose old ones. Some become archaic and obsolete; some are forgotten. Some, once thought to be clear, simple, and unambiguous, no longer seem the same. Some become entirely different. And *semantics* itself is part of that ever-changing stream. The meanings of words change in many ways; and it is difficult, if not impossible, to predict the particular manifestation that may apply in the case of a particular word.

But there are precedents. And although analogy is often misleading, one cannot help being reminded of the fate that has overtaken *rhetoric*. As Allen Walker Read puts it:

> Fallen from its high status in the pattern of the medieval schoolmen, it now usually occurs in the phrase 'mere rhetoric,' with reference to discourse that is insincere, pretentious, or mendacious. In similar popular use, *semantics* often appears in contexts that tend to bolster word-magic rather than combat it.[1]

The rapid extension in the use of *semantics* has in fact been so marked that a specialist writing on the subject felt obligated to specify and to justfiy his own use of the term, as follows:

> It is perhaps worthwhile saying that semantics as it is conceived in this paper (and in former papers of the author) is a sober and modest discipline which has no pretentions of being a universal patent-medicine for all ills and diseases of mankind, whether imaginary or real. You will not find in semantics any remedy for decayed teeth or illusions of grandeur or class conflicts. Nor is semantics a device for establishing that everyone except the speaker and his friends is speaking nonsense.[2]

The eventual manifestation of semantic change that may apply to *semantics* can, nonetheless, not yet be predicted, despite its "vulgarization." It cannot yet be said that the meaning of *semantics* will be narrowed, as in the case of *deer*, for instance, which once meant a beast of any kind; or that it will be expanded, as in the case of *manuscript*, which is frequently extended to describe something that is typewritten as well as something that is handwritten; or that it will be elevated, as in the case of *marshal*, which once meant a lad who looked after the mares; or that *semantics* will truly degenerate in meaning, as in the case of *knave*, which once meant simply a boy or male servant.[3] Only time will tell what will happen to the meaning of the word *semantics*. But insight can be gained into the mechanism of semantic change by examining some of the linguistic factors that can give rise to the variety in usage now manifested in *semantics*.

Let us begin with a definition of the term in question. Let us say that *semantics* is *the study of the dynamics of meaning in language*. As thus defined, *semantics* is meant to complement *phonetics*, which, in turn, may be de-

John B. Newman (Ph.D. New York University, 1950) is Assistant Professor of Speech at Queens College of the City of New York.

[1] "An Account of the Word 'Semantics,'" *Word*, IV (1948), 91.

[2] Alfred Tarski, "The Semantic Conception of Truth and the Foundations of Semantics," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, IV (1944), 345; reprinted in Leonard Linsky, ed., *Semantics and the Philosophy of Language* (Urbana, Ill., 1952), p. 17.

[3] See Leonard Bloomfield, *Language* (New York, 1933), pp. 425-443; Margaret Schlauch, *The Gift of Tongues* (New York, 1945), pp. 109-132; and Norman P. Sacks, "A Linguist's View of the Current Public School Controversy," *AAUP Bulletin*, XXXIX (1953), 80-84.

fined as "the study of the dynamics of sound in language." Together, *phonetics* and *semantics* may constitute a basis for *phonemics*. Thus, for example, the fact that the phonetic fascicle [la:f] refers to one semantic fascicle ["life"] in one dialect of American speech (Southern) and to another ["laugh"] in a second dialect (Eastern) forms a basis for the development of a phonemic structuring of American English;[4] just as, conversely, the fact that the meaning of such pairs of words as *pin-bin, cap-cab, prim-brim, played-blade, ample-amble, harper-harbor,* and *napping-nabbing* can be distinguished as a result of the distinctive sound-features of /p/ and /b/ also contributes to the same sort of analysis.[5]

Now as so frequently happens in defining a word, many of the words used in its definition must themselves be defined. In the case of the present definition of *semantics,* there are three: *dynamics, meaning,* and *language.* For present purposes, let *dynamics* refer to "status and change (event and process)." Thus, semantics is the study of the status and change (event and process) of meaning in language; just as, again, phonetics is the study of the status and change (event and process) of sound in language, and phonemics is the study of the status and change (event and process) of sound in relation to meaning in language.[6]

Let *meaning* refer, first, to the function of the copula. Thus, if "a clock" *is* "a device for measuring or indicating time," then "a clock" *means* "a device for measuring or indicating time." Let *meaning* also refer to "equation" or the "equal sign" of mathematics (=), of chemistry (→), of symbolic logic (≡), and so on. Thus, if "x" *equals* "2" (however the equation is symbolized), then, "x" *means* "2." Let *meaning,* next, refer to "equivalence." Thus, if a given mass balances another called "an ounce," then that mass *means* "an ounce," with this construct referring not only to weight but to all forms of intensity, including speech itself (as in "verbal equivalence"). Let *meaning* also refer to "symbolization," which encompasses those forms of abstraction, condensation, and representation in which, as Lewis Mumford puts it, some components of the human mind's experience elicit consciousness, beliefs, emotions, and usages respecting other components of its experience.[7] Thus, if "dog" evokes the concept of a type of animal of various specific manifestations, such as Airedale, Boxer, Chow, Dachshund, etc., then

[4] See C. K. Thomas, *An Introduction to the Phonetics of American English* (New York, 1947), pp. 170-171.

[5] See Edgar H. Sturtevant, *An Introduction to Linguistic Science* (New Haven, 1947), p. 15; also Bloomfield, pp. 74-92, esp. p. 80. This interpretation of the sources cited here centers on a major area of disagreement among linguistic scientists, viz., the status of meaning in linguistics. Some linguicists (see footnote 13 below) avoid all semantic and psychological criteria in their analyses and believe "that such criteria play no part, or at least need not play one, in the theoretical foundation of phonemics"; that "theoretically it would be possible to arrive at the phonemic system of a dialect entirely on the basis of phonetics and distribution, without any appeal to meaning" (Bernard Bloch, "A Set of Postulates for Phonemic Analysis," *Language,* XXIV [1948], 5), and that phonemes and distinctive features are simply recurrent partials and their components (see, for instance, Zellig Harris, "Simultaneous Components in Phonology," *Language,* XX [1944], 181-205); whereas others speak of "common semantic distinctiveness" (Eugene A. Nida, *Morphology* [Ann Arbor, Mich., 1949], pp. 7 and 14 *et passim*) and the discriminative function of the phoneme and the distinctive feature, which is quite clearly based upon a semantic assumption (R. Jakobson, C.G.M. Fant, and M. Halle, *Preliminaries to Speech Analysis* [Cambridge, Mass., 1952], pp. 1-2 and 14 *et passim*). For a more complete discussion of this problem, see Paul L. Garvin's review of Jakobson, Fant, and Halle in *Language,* XXIX (1953), 472-481, and John B. Carroll, *The Study of Language* (Cambridge, Mass., 1953), Chapter 2, esp. pp. 12-13 and pp. 31-35.

[6] See Bernard Bloch and George L. Trager, *Outline of Linguistic Analysis* (Baltimore, 1942), pp. 38-52, esp. pp. 39 and 46; also Sturtevant, pp. 15-18. (See footnote 5 above.)

[7] *Art and Technics* (New York, 1952), p. 19.

"dog" can mean any one, several, or all of those animals.[8]

The structure of meaning, like the structure of sound, consists of supra-segmental patterns as well as segmental units. Thus, meaning is not built upon morphological, lexical, grammatical, syntactical, rhetorical, and poetical bases alone but is founded equally upon prosodic, psycholinguistic,[9] kinesic,[10] and communicative[11] bases as well. In more simple terms, meaning obtains in more than "words" and word-combinations alone. The study of word-meanings, then, is but a single unit of the manifold study of meaning. The study of vocabulary, consisting of the definitions of words and their denotations and connotations, and the comparison of their use synchronically (among dialects) and/or diachronically (in the history of a single dialect) make up but one area of the study of meaning. Indeed, translation, which abuts and overlaps here, is but another segment of the larger study of meaning which constitutes the area of semantics. The study of "correct usage," clever statement, poetical license, and the search for *le mot juste* do not alone make up the contents of the area of semantics but only one small portion thereof. Meaning can be communicated linguistically by means other than words. Since this is quite an ordinary phenomenon, the study of those supra-segmental patterns which make it so is as integral a part of the study of meaning as the investigation of the more commonly discussed segmental units, such as morphemes, words, phrases, clauses, and sentences.

The third and perhaps most important term in our definition of *semantics* is the word *language*. English makes this one word do for three discrete concepts. And although every speaker of English comprehends all three and could describe them easily enough, the use of but a single word to stand for three separate referents makes for confusion. Rather than struggle Laocoönwise with English, then, we will borrow some foreign technical terms to distinguish the three separate concepts denoted by the single English word *language*. These technical terms are French and were invented by Ferdinand de Saussure,[12] the noted Swiss linguicist.[13] According to the Saussurian scheme, *language* subsumes the following discrete classifications.

All aspects of human "verbal" exchange, whether spoken or written, are considered as *langage*, a categorization

[8] The meaning of animal cries in various languages is another example of symbolization. English *cock-a-doodle-doo*, French *coquericot*, German *kikiriki*, Italian *cicerici*, Swedish *kukelik*, Romanian *cucuriva*, Chinese *kiao kiao*, and Manchu *dchor-dchor*, for instance, all elicit consciousness of the same component of human experience. In this regard, see Eric H. Lenneberg, "Cognition in Ethnolinguistics," *Language*, XXIX (1953), 463-471.

[9] See John B. Carroll *et al.*, *Report and Recommendations of the Interdisciplinary Summer Seminar in Psychology and Linguistics*, mimeo., (Ithaca, New York, 1951), pp. 9-13; and Charles E. Osgood, ed. "Psycholinguistics: A Survey of Theory and Research Problems," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLIX, No. 4, Pt. 2 (Oct., 1954), 61 *et passim*.

[10] See Ray L. Birdwhistell, *Introduction to Kinesics* (Louisville, Ky., 1952); M. Critchley, *The Language of Gesture* (London, 1939); and D. Efron, *Gesture and Environment* (New York, 1941).

[11] See S. S. Stevens, "A Definition of Communication," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, XXII (1950), 689-690.

[12] De Saussure lived from 1857 to 1913. His *Cours de linguistique générale*, the first edition of which was published posthumously in Paris in 1916, was edited by two disciples, Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, from students' notes (not their own) on lectures given by de Saussure. For a summary and evaluation of his work, see Rulon S. Wells, "De Saussure's System of Linguistics," *Word*, III (1947), 1-31.

[13] *Linguicist* is a term invented by Allen Walker Read to signify a specialist in linguistics, a "scientific student of language" (rather than the "awkward and cumbersome" *linguistician*) as distinguished from *linguist*, meaning "polyglot." See his "The Term 'Meaning' in Linguistics," *ETC.: A Review of General Semantics*, XIII (1955), 41-42, footnote 17.

which encompasses "the entire complex of phenomena associated with human vocal and auditory communication of emotions and ideas . . . [comprising] each and every one of these phenomena from the first babblings of the infant and the most rudimentary forms of human speech to the most highly developed types of man's utterance."[14] *Langage*, as thus defined, is a process and does not pertain to any particular dialect or tongue. *Langage* is the *process* of communication. It is a social manifestation and, like any social manifestation, is subject to perpetual change. *Langage* may, therefore, be analyzed at any one time into an inherited or institutional element and an element of innovation.[15]

De Saussure calls the institutional element *langue*. *Langue* is the *phenomenon* of language. For present purposes, *langue* may be thought of as "a particular language," a tongue, or a dialect in the broadest sense of the term. *Langue* refers to each and every system of acoustic-*cum*-visual symbols used in communication that is independent of the volition of its individual users. We use "acoustic" here instead of "phonetic" or "phonemic" in order to allow for the inclusion of non-speech sounds such as the snap of the fingers or a clap of the hands. "Visual" permits the inclusion of gestures, physical movements, facial expression, and bodily mien, as well as any other "visual aid" that may be brought to bear on any form of speech, even including orthography and punctuation. *Langue* could, thus, conceivably include music, art, and the dance as well as speech. In sum, *langue* is a code, a tool or instrument of communication.

The innovational element of *langue* is *parole*. *Parole*, or the *activity* of speech, is characterized by Louis Gray as "the individualistic aspect of *langage* in contrast with the social aspect of *langue*."[16] Thus, while no two speakers talk in exactly the same way, their particular speech-utterances (*parole*) can be thought of as "a limited set of observable behaviors" tied together by a shared understanding of the same underlying system (*langue*) and formulated according to it.[17] "*Langue* and *parole* stand in a chicken-and-egg relation to each other. On the one hand, *parole* is based on *langue;* we might restate de Saussure's idea in Aristotelian terms and say that *langue* is the active potentiality of producing *parole*. And on the other hand, 'c'est la parole qui fait évoluer la langue.' "[18] That being the case, *langue* and *parole* (language and speech) cannot, nor should they attempt to, restrict or even constrict each other. The corpus, or sample of speech, cannot refute the system and remain intelligible; nor should the system refuse a possible, intelligible utterance. The record of *parole* is the record of usage; and "correct" or "incorrect," "grammatical" or "ungrammatical," "logical" or "illogical," usage is not only justified systematically but is an indication of the manner and type of change that will be brought about in *langue*, for "nothing exists in language which has not previously existed in speech."[19]

There are, then, as many *types* of "semantics" as there are *types* of "language." Thus, if by *semantics* "the study of the dynamics of meaning in *langage*" is what is meant, we have one type of semantics: *la sémantique du langage*, or the semantics of the *process* of

[14] Louis H. Gray, *Foundations of Language* (New York, 1939), p. 15.
[15] Wells, p. 15.
[16] *Op. cit.*, p. 18.
[17] Garvin, p. 474.
[18] Wells, p. 17.
[19] William J. Entwistle, *Aspects of Language* (London, 1953), p. 73.

communication. If "the study of the dynamics of meaning in *langue*" is what is meant, we have a second: *la sémantique de la langue*, or the semantics of the *phenomenon* of language. And if "the study of the dynamics of meaning in *parole*" is what is meant, we have a third: *la sémantique de la parole*, or the semantics of the *activity* of speech. Thus, without the benefit of one or another kind of extensionalizing device, the variety in usage of *semantics* is the result of the confusion engendered by the representation of several discrete, interstitial areas by a single all-encompassing title. The confusion, then, is in the language or talk *about* semantics and not in semantics itself. The Saussurian terminology presented here helps to clarify the language of semantics and so makes a general overview of its area comprehensible. Let us, then, examine the three types of semantics.

Starting with what may now be called the semantics of communication (*la sémantique du langage*), it will be remembered that *langage* or the *process* of communication, transcends any particular system of symbols; it is a social manifestation and does not pertain to any particular *langue*. It is, however, specifically concerned with the way in which *langue* is used and the use to which *langue* is put. The semantics of *langage* subsumes three coordinate areas of study concerned with the philosophic, the cultural, and the scientific implications of the study of meaning.

Philosophic semantics is an inquiry into the philosophy of language which explores its symbolic or representative aspect. "Its studies center about the relation of designation and the concept of truth."[20] Its purpose is to analyze philosophical formulations, which may be obscured by so-called "philosophical language," first by analyzing that language with a view towards finding a materially adequate and formally correct definition of truth. Otherwise the reader of such a philosophical formulation will presumably be convinced that it must be his fault if he does not understand it. "He therefore would read it again and again and thus would eventually reach a stage in which he thinks he has understood it."[21] If, in the analysis of the language of a philosophical formulation, it is discovered that no new idea has been set forth—that the formulation merely served a propositional function and was not strictly a proposition—much is learned and new avenues of approach to even greater knowledge are opened. Thus, for instance, Leibniz could anticipate the logical principles of Einstein's theory of relativity when he realized that the Copernican system differed from the Ptolemaic in that it was simply another way of saying the same thing.[22] If, on the other hand, it becomes apparent that the definition of truth cannot obtain a precise meaning in a given language because the structure of that language is not precisely and completely known,[23] problems of definition and explication can be approached by way of a so-called "artificial language,"[24] such as the Boolean algebra or one of the other forms of symbolic logic. This has generally been the method of the scientific empiricists and the logical positivists; this was generally the method of Russell and Whitehead and of the Vienna Circle—a group of writers including, among others, Rudolf Carnap, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Otto

[20] Herbert Feigl, "Logical Empiricism," *Twentieth Century Philosophy*, ed. Dagobert D. Runes (New York, 1943), p. 378.

[21] Hans Reichenbach, *The Rise of Scientific Philosophy* (Berkeley, Cal., 1951), p. 3.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 107.

[23] Tarski, p. 347.

[24] Linsky, p. 5.

Neurath, Alfred Tarski, Herbert Feigl, and Moritz Schlick.[25] The names of C. S. Peirce, A. J. Ayer, Charles Morris, and Hans Reichenbach[26] should also be mentioned here as philosophers concerned with the systematic pursuit of the problem of meaning by means of a logical analysis of language—the contents of the area of philosophic semantics.

Cultural semantics inquires into the meanings of linguistic forms in terms of the point-by-point and pattern-by-pattern relations between the language system and the other cultural systems of a given community.[27] In other words, cultural semantics studies the dynamics of meaning in terms of relationships that exist between the language a society possesses and its other systematic arrangements of cultural items.[28] As such, cultural semantics is closely allied to ethnolinguistics in that linguistic and non-linguistic behavior must be simultaneously considered in order to discover the meaning that is implied by the relationships that may exist between what people do when talking or as a result of talking and what they say when doing a particular thing.[29] Strictly speaking, cultural semantics transcends, or is external to, the study of linguistics as such (i.e., it is "metalinguistic" or "exolinguistic") in that it is primarily concerned with the relationship a particular dialect may have to its speakers' cognitive processes. Cultural semantics may, therefore, be intracultural in its method (by correlating speech behavior with recognition behavior rather than with linguistic forms) or it may be cross-cultural (by using the translation method).[30] In all cases, however, cultural semantics studies the dynamics of meaning in the process of *langage*. Though the work of Benjamin Lee Whorf, Bronislaw Malinowski, Clyde Kluckhohn, Dorothy Lee, and Edward Sapir as well as other linguistic-anthropologists is to be considered, in this area, the writings of F. S. C. Northrop, Lewis Mumford, and David Riesman must also be regarded as pertinent. Neither Northrop, Mumford, nor Riesman are students of language *qua* language, but their studies in the dynamics of meaning in other cultural systems of society make their work pertinent to cultural semantics.

Scientific semantics is cognitive in its study in that it seeks to isolate and examine the phenomena that constitute meaning in the *process* of *langage*. Since it is specifically concerned with the mechanism of meaning, scientific semantics comprehends the scope of communication and information theory to the extent that meaning is involved. By its nature scientific semantics is concerned with organismic as well as non-organismic communicative systems. In the case of an organismic communicative system, it comprehends the physiological

[25] Feigl, pp. 405-409.

[26] This list of names, just as those which follow, is meant to be representative rather than comprehensive. There are, in each instance, many others who either wrote in the same or similar genres as those listed or who approached the study along independent lines. The names mentioned, however, are typical of methodological approaches to the problem being considered.

[27] George L. Trager, *The Field of Linguistics* (Norman, Okla., 1950), p. 7.

[28] A cultural system has been defined as a segment of environment that is ordered into a pattern or organized subsystems. Thus, a culture consists of many systems: there are, for instance, besides language, such patterned segments as kinship systems, numeral systems, status systems, technological systems, the organization of the physical universe into a chemical system of atoms and molecules, a systematic botany, etc. See, for instance, M. B. Emeneau, "Language and Non-Linguistic Patterns," *Language*, XXVI (1950), 199-209; E. A. Kennard, *Understanding Foreign People* (Washington, D. C., 1949); H. L. Smith, Jr. and C. A. Ferguson, *Language and Culture* (Washington, D. C., 1951).

[29] David L. Olmsted, *Ethnolinguistics So Far* (Norman, Okla., 1950), p. 10.

[30] Lenneberg, pp. 470-471.

and psychological, the pathological, and the acoustic and auditory factors involved; whereas, in the case of a non-organismic communicative system, it comprehends the constituent mathematical, physical, mechanical, electrical, and electronic factors. Four areas of scientific literature are therefore pertinent to the study of scientific semantics: one is typified in "the 'operationalism' of the physicist P. W. Bridgman, who belongs in the scientific tradition of Ernst Mach and Henri Poincaré";[31] a second, in the cybernetics of Norbert Wiener, and the information theory of C. W. Shannon and Warren Weaver and other workers in that field; a third, in the writings of Hughlings Jackson, Henry Head, and Kurt Goldstein, and more recently in the writings on psycholinguistics; and a fourth, in the work now being done in mechanical translation, sometimes referred to as "microsemantics," by such figures as Yehoshuah Bar Hillel, Anthony Oettinger, and others. Thus do the philosophic, the cultural, and the scientific aspects of the study circumscribe the contents of the semantics of *langage*.

Let us now turn to a consideration of the semantics of *langue*, which investigates the dynamics of meaning in the *phenomenon* of language (*la sémantique de la langue*). Formerly known by the somewhat cumbersome title of semasiology, this study is strictly a linguistic discipline and may, therefore, best be called *linguistic semantics*. It can obtain in the systematic examination of one or more codes or dialects, applying to such categories as French, Arabic, Turkish, for instance; or American English, British English; or Virginia Tidewater American English, Middle Atlantic American English; or formal English, colloquial English, etc. Thus, from among the speaker-message-hearer relationships, linguistic semantics is concerned mainly with the dynamics of meaning in the message *per se*.[32] At the risk of oversimplifying the case, linguistic semantics is concerned with the meaning of words, word-forms, word-groups, and word-arrangements. What do they mean? How did they come to mean what they do? What do they mean in other localities where the same dialect, variants of the same dialect, or a different dialect is spoken? What did they mean in other times? What were the linguistic, sociological, and historical processes that brought about the changes? These are some of the questions with which linguistic semantics is concerned. Obviously lexicography and dialect geography are closely related to this area, for the study of neologisms and coinages, adaptations, survivals, and foreign adoptions is central to it. The work of such men as Leonard Bloomfield, C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, Gustaf Stern, and Hans Kurath (specifically in the work with which he is associated on the *Linguistic Atlas*) to a large extent circumscribes the contents of this area. Indeed it might be said that the chapters on "semantics" to be found in most introductory language texts (and, lately, some speech texts) are concerned with the area of linguistic semantics.

Linguistic semantics subsumes at least three and possibly four suborders of semantics. All are generally concerned with *langue* (the code, the message), but each specializes in a particular field, namely, scripture, literature, the law, and politics; and from these specialties does each derive its name. *Scriptural semantics*, or hermeneutics, is the science

[31] S. I. Hayakawa, "Semantics," *ETC.: A Review of General Semantics*, IX (1952), 245.

[32] Carroll, 1951, p. 7ff.

of interpreting the language of a text, usually of sacred scripture. It includes the definition of the rules by which the precise meaning of scriptural texts may be ascertained, and is the basis for exegesis. The recent publication of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, with its sometimes startling revisions of the language of the King James Version, made the problems inherent in the various aspects of this study widely known. On a more secular level, scriptural semantics can be concerned with the problems of the interpretation of ambiguous language added to the problem of whether the ambiguity was intentional or not. So, for instance, "the historian's task is to understand not only what a document's words may formally mean but also what his witness really *intended to say*."[33]

Literary semantics, as its title indicates, is concerned with literature of all kinds. Since literature, by its very nature, cannot be exactly defined, rhetorical works must also be included in this consideration. Indeed the name of this area might be *rhetorical semantics* just as well as literary semantics. Since "rhetorical" connotes manifestations that are separately considered in this analysis, we will, for present purposes, call this area literary semantics with the understanding that rhetorical works will be included in its consideration. The area of literary semantics abuts directly on the field of scriptural semantics, the distinction being largely one of authorship and intention. It is the function of literary semantics to interpret the language of a literary or rhetorical work or any portion thereof, the purpose being interpretative rather than hermeneutical, as in the case of scriptural semantics. The interpretation of a literary or rhetorical work can be a creation as artistic in its origin as the work it attempts to recreate, whereas the exegesis of a scriptural work, on the other hand, should be a revelation as didactic in its origin as the text it attempts to comprehend. Since it is the function of literary semantics to interpret the language of a written work, it comprehends the area of the "New Criticism" and the "New Rhetoric." A good portion of all literary and rhetorical criticism is concerned with the meaning of the language of the work in question, the "newness" of the literary or rhetorical criticism, as the case may be, being measured in direct proportion to the degree with which it is concerned with semantics. In the specific field of literary semantics the names of William Empson and John Crowe Ransom are perhaps typical; in that of rhetorical semantics, Kenneth Burke is outstanding, though I. A. Richards should also be mentioned. It should be noted incidentally that the relationship between rhetoric and semantics is, and should be, no longer considered as antithetic but rather as catalytic.

Legal semantics is the study of the dynamics of meaning in the language of the law. According to the present Saussurian classification, legal semantics is a derivation of linguistic semantics parallel in method to both scriptural and literary semantics. In other words, legal semantics is specifically concerned with the manifestations and ramifications of *langue* in all statements referring to the law. Legal semantics, however, must be distinguished from the profession of law itself. The great bulk of legal literature, though generally concerned with problems of meaning, cannot be thought of as legal semantics; that would be mistaking a part for the whole. The opinions of a jurist like Benjamin N. Cardozo, for instance, many of which hinge

[33] Louis Gottschalk, *Understanding History* (New York, 1950), p. 134.

on the interpretation of the meaning of a single word, cannot be thought of as legal semantics; rather are they examples of legal judgments as applied to specific cases. But modern students of law of the "functionalist" and "legal realist" schools, including Morris R. Cohen, Jerome Frank, Thurman Arnold, Felix S. Cohen, and others, who have critically examined traditional legal concepts "in order that lawyers might to some degree moderate their tendency to hypnotize themselves with their own terminology"[34] can be said to have contributed to the literature of legal semantics.

A fourth area that deserves mention at this point may be called *political semantics*. This phase of semantics may be described as "an enquiry into the use and abuse of language in the making of political theories" and is concerned with "the uses of political words."[35] Much of the work of Harold Lasswell and his associates would make it seem that a study such as political semantics should come under one of the other headings in our present classification. In keeping with the Saussurian system here being applied, however, the apparent restriction of this area to words, vocabulary, and language (in the sense of *langue*) would justify its being mentioned subordinately to linguistic semantics.

In summary, then, the study of the dynamics of meaning in *langue*, the *phenomenon* of language, gives rise to a linguistic discipline, called linguistic semantics, that is concerned specifically with the events and processes involved in the structure of the meaning of the message *per se*, and which subsumes three or possibly four subject-matter areas, namely, scriptural semantics, literary (or rhetorical) semantics, legal semantics, and political semantics.

There remains then to be considered the semantics of *parole* according to the present Saussurian classification. *Parole*, it will be recalled, is the *activity* of speech—the innovational element of *langage*. As the individualistic aspect of *langage*, *parole* consists of particular speech-utterances and so comprehends all the ways that people put things when they talk to each other. With the freedom and the ability that entails participation in *langage* and with the possession of the system of *langue*, what a speaker will do in a particular situation and in certain circumstances will be a manifestation of *parole*. *Parole* may, therefore, appear at a given moment to be "incorrect," "substandard," "emotive," "archaic," "impolite," or what you will; but being the stuff of communication, *parole* has served its purpose if communication has been achieved. Thus, any study of *parole* is necessarily a study of individual speakers in given situations and as such it is necessarily a psychological discipline. In keeping with the present system of terminology, therefore, the semantics of *parole* will be called *psychological semantics*.

> The development of the radio, the printing press, and the movies makes possible an enormous extension of influence not essentially different in kind from hypnosis. Great masses of individuals repeat each week what has been digested for their belief, buy things which they approve because they have been shown a pretty girl or a 'scientist' using such articles, mechanically repeat actions which they have been assured ought to be performed. Behavior becomes stereotyped, monotonous, compulsive, and pathic. The individual loses his integrity, his spontaneity, his flexibility.[36]

The semantics of *parole*, therefore, "has largely been devoted to the therapy of

[34] Hayakawa, p. 246.

[35] T. D. Weldon, *The Vocabulary of Politics* (London, 1953), subtitle of the book, and the title of Chapter 3, respectively.

[36] Charles Morris, *Signs, Language and Behavior* (New York, 1946), p. 240.

the individual, aiming to protect the individual against exploitation by others and by himself."[37] As such, the semantics of *parole* comprehends the scope of Alfred Korzybski's "General Semantics," Carl Rogers' "non-directive" counseling techniques, Kurt Lewin's "group dynamics,"[38] and, to the extent that it studies the meaning of unconscious psychological symbols, Freud's psychoanalytical techniques.[39] The studies of vision and visual interpretation carried on by Adelbert Ames and Gyorgy Kepes should also be included in the scope of psychological semantics. Although not directly applied to the therapy of the individual, the work of Ames and Kepes can be applied "to protect the individual against exploitation by others and by himself," and so can be subsumed by psychological semantics.

This, then, is the area of semantics, the topology of its field. As the study of the dynamics of meaning in language, semantics applies to everything in which language is a factor—an area, to say the least, of considerable range and scope. Obviously then, the term "semantics" needs to be specified in order that its own usage be meaningful. The Saussurian classification presented here offers a means for such specification in the light of the very language processes that semantics subsumes. Although the eventual manifestation of semantic change that may apply in the case of the term itself cannot now be predicted, we might well apply Herbert Feigl's definition of philosophy to semantics and keep in mind, when using the term, that semantics need not be "the disease of which it should be the cure."

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 283.
[38] Hayakawa, pp. 252-253.
[39] Morris, p. 276.

• • •

THE SPECIALIZATION OF ROLES AND FUNCTIONS IN A GROUP

Franklyn S. Haiman

The following article with commentaries and rejoinder is the first publication of a special committee sponsored by the Interest Group in Discussion and Group Methods of the SAA. According to Dean C. Barnlund of the School of Speech at Northwestern University, the chairman of the committee, its purpose is to promote "the writing of speculative and theoretical papers on a number of provoking problems concerning the operation of face-to-face groups." The paper written by Franklyn S. Haiman, Associate Professor of Public Speaking at Northwestern, was circulated among persons especially interested in the subject, two of whom wrote commentaries. The author was then given an opportunity to prepare a rejoinder. The two commentators are Gale E. Jensen of the School of Education at the University of Michigan and William E. Utterback, Professor of Speech and director of discussion activities at Ohio State University.

ONE of the most interesting phenomena which have emerged from the study of group behavior in recent years is the striking parallel which seems to exist between the functional problems of a small group and those of societies at large. Study of the problems of leadership, for example, or of the methods for handling conflict, furnishes illustrations of the way in which generalizations about small group behavior can be applied to the behavior of mass organizations, and vice versa. But perhaps the clearest parallel of all is that which concerns the specialization of roles and functions. It appears that much can be learned about the need for specialization in small groups by studying the ways in which society at large tends to divide its work. On the other hand, it seems that the functioning of society at large may be improved by the insights provided through experimentation in small groups with new patterns of specialization.

Before we can do much, however, with these challenging analogies, it would be well to clarify our thinking about some of the basic concepts and principles involved in the processes of specialization, whether in a small group or large society. What is specialization? How and why does it occur?

I think it can be asserted, with little possibility of dispute, that there are natural tendencies within any group that meets or works together over an extended period of time for differentiations to emerge among the members. These will occur, if for no other reason, simply because people *are* different from one another, with different interests, aptitudes, and abilities. As they talk and work together, and get to know each other, these differences become more and more apparent. What, after all, does "getting to know someone" mean other than becoming more and more aware of his unique characteristics? It is a common experience among people who have had little or no contact with a particular racial or nationality group, for instance, to think of that group as an undifferentiated mass, in which it is hard to tell the individual members apart. "All Chinese look alike to me," is a sometimes heard expression of this feeling.

This is not to say that as people in a group come to know one another better they may not also develop stronger feelings of unity or commonality. On the contrary, people who were once strangers and even antagonists often find, as they become better acquainted, that they

have a great deal in common, either by virtue simply of their being members of the human race, or because they share even more specific attributes, aspirations, loyalties, or enmities. But despite this likelihood of an ever increasing discovery of unity among people, there is also the inevitable increase of awareness of differences. As these differences become clearer, and begin to fall into consistent patterns, it is only natural that members of a group will begin to regard them as relatively stable features of the group's "personality." Hence, if it develops that one member of the group has a particularly lively sense of humor, he may come to be regarded as the group jokester, and be expected to "specialize" in that role more or less consistently. Another member, who reveals a special aptitude for having "bright ideas," may soon come to be depended upon to perform most of the "initiating" functions, thus taking on the specialized role of "group initiator." These titles, it should be understood, are not formally bestowed upon the individual, nor may the group even be conscious that this process of specialization has taken place. Nevertheless, the fact that each individual member comes into the group with a unique background of experiences and with characteristic ways of behaving is bound to provide the first impetus towards specialization.

There are also other forces at work which intensify this tendency. One of these is the strong need, which exists in all of us, to create some measure of stability in our relationships with others. Surely everyone has experienced the feeling of uneasiness which occurs when he first comes into contact with a new group of people. This tension is gradually eased as the conversation, work, or play (depending on the type of group) proceeds, and the individuals get to know one another. Why is this so? One reason is that, in a strange situation where we know nothing about the other people, we do not know what to expect from them and hence do not quite know what to do ourselves. In other words there are no established patterns to follow— no *system* of relationships has yet been worked out. Because we know nothing about the characteristic behavior patterns of the others, we have no basis upon which to predict how others are likely to act. We do not know what things we can rely upon them to do, nor what we must do ourselves. Thus people are eager, in any new association with others, to find out what these others are like, and to stabilize the relationship with them. Even if the patterns which develop are unpleasant ones, such as the other person's doing all of the talking and your doing all of the listening (some people, of course, like this pattern), it may be preferable to have some predictable pattern than none at all. At least you "know where you stand," and can behave accordingly. The awkwardness of uncertainty is eliminated.

This need to "size up a situation" often leads to hasty and unwise judgments about other people, which fact itself testifies to the urgency of the need. It is a rather common phenomenon, for example, for groups to stereotype certain of their members, unfair as these stereotypes may be, just so they may have the comfort of at least thinking they know what "Joe is like." Joe may be labeled a "big talker," a "nonparticipant," a "natural leader," a "hard-worker," or a "crackpot." It should be noted that in each case, specialized behavior patterns are described which are designed to help the other members know what to expect from Joe and how to respond to him.

An interesting sidelight on the importance of setting up stable patterns of interpersonal relationships in small groups is contained in the criticism which William F. Whyte, in his pamphlet entitled *Leadership and Group Participation,* has made of the training procedures employed by the National Training Laboratory for Group Development at Bethel, Maine. It was Whyte's observation that the so-called nondirective method of leadership used in the groups he analyzed caused the members to become so preoccupied with the problem of finding and establishing stable interpersonal patterns that they could not get any work done. The need to settle the question of "where they stood" vis-à-vis one another interfered with any attempts to focus on an external task. Whyte wisely concludes from this that before a group can efficiently concentrate on the objective tasks before it, some measure of stability in the differentiation of roles and functions must be present. He errs, however, in seeming to assume that this pattern can only be prescribed in advance by the leader, and that a nondirectively led group cannot pass, through its own efforts, beyond this initial stage of preoccupation with its own processes. He also fails to see that for group *training* purposes, where the "work" to be done is nothing more than the gaining of insight into procedural problems, this preoccupation with leadership and interpersonal relations may be exactly what is most needed.

In addition to the fact of individual differences, and to the psychological need for stability and predictability, there is still a third force, which might be called an economic need, that leads groups in the direction of specialization. It is the principle, well-known in economics, of the division of labor. It is, in fact, this principle which has made it worth while throughout all of history for men as well as animals to band together in groups. If one man hunts while another fishes and a third builds shelter, all can have more of the good things of life than if each tries to do everything for himself. It is not that the total each one must produce is any less, for the hunter must now hunt for three instead of for one, but rather that by specializing in one activity the hunter can become more proficient at it, thus doing it in less time and with less expenditure of energy. All groups and societies are built, to one degree or another, upon this principle. Especially as the work which must be done becomes more and more complex—a common phenomenon in the twentieth century—the need increases to divide it up among a variety of specialists each of whom can contribute what his interests and talents make him best suited for.

The extent to which a division of labor will, or should, take place depends not only on the complexity of the problems being dealt with but also on the type of group. The separate roles and functions of the individual members of a professional football team—center, guard, tackle, end, quarterback—are much more clearly and formally defined than those of the members of a committee, which may have nothing more by way of group structure than a recorder, a rotating chairmanship, and ordinary members. To be sure, on the actual functioning level, with no formal designations, there may be fairly consistent roles evident, such as those of initiator, clarifier, devil's advocate, conflict resolver, and summarizer; but one would not expect these patterns to be

as permanent and stable as the football squad assignments.

There are some authorities on discussion leadership, notably William Utterback of Ohio State University, who take what has been said in the preceding paragraphs as justification for their contention that the most effective way to operate a discussion group is to have one person designated as the chairman, whose job it is to *specialize* in methodological problems, leaving the other members of the group free to concentrate on the substantive matters at hand. The chairman becomes a procedural expert, a professional at leading discussions. Like the coxswain in a crew, he calls the signals while the rest of the group put their muscles to the job. This arrangement, it is argued, respects the principle of division of labor; whereas the so-called leaderless group makes everyone responsible for everything, and no one adept at anything.

The "leader-as-process-specialist" point of view overlooks two important considerations. In the first place, it seems to assume that leadership and the handling of interpersonal relations constitute a battery of functions which require the attention of only one member of the group, whereas the substantive task is something to which all other members must give their undivided attention. In other words, the division of labor is made on the basis of process versus content, with process being the primary concern of the leader and the content shared among the members. If, however, one takes the view, as this writer is inclined to do, that the functions of leadership are not only too complex for one person to handle adequately, but that they so vitally affect substantive matters that they cannot safely be separated from them ("The ends pre-exist in the means," said Emerson), then one is likely to make the division of labor in a somewhat different way. The various aspects of leadership—initiating discussion, regulating participation, making procedural suggestions, summarizing, resolving conflict, etc.—are seen as discrete functions in which members of the group other than the chairman should become specialists, and which they can combine in a relatively spontaneous way with their "regular membership" contributions. Although it must be admitted that this arrangement does not make for a clearly defined, stable, and entirely predictable pattern of responsibilities, it is my contention that through the development of informal group norms sufficient structure can be maintained to dispatch the kind of work that most discussion groups face. It must be remembered that group decision-making, by its very nature, does not call for the rigid degree of patterning required to get a football over an opposing team's goal line.

Not only are the sharp differentiations of role and function which characterize football teams and other highly organized units unnecessary in discussion groups, they are also undesirable. This is the second consideration which proponents of the "leader-as-process-specialist" school of thought, as well as those who advocate other kinds of stabilized specialization, overlook. The recognition that there are natural forces which tend to push groups in the direction of differentiation, and that a certain amount of specialization is not only inevitable but fruitful, does not mean that one must accept, endorse, and even encourage the extension of this process to its logical conclusions. There are, in fact, many good reasons why one should not.

In the first place, most groups exist not only for the purpose of achieving

certain material goals but also to satisfy the companionship needs of their members. The growing concern shown by organizations like modern industry and the armed services over the maintenance of high "morale" testifies to the importance they place on good relationships among group members, not only as a pleasant end in itself, but also for its indirect, ultimate effect upon production. There is considerable evidence, however, that an increase in role differentiation within a group works counter to the development of friendship and group cohesiveness. The cycle seems to work in the following way: (1) Division of labor leads to specialization. (2) Some specialties are more important to the group than others, and a higher value is therefore placed upon them. (3) Rewards and prestige are granted in accordance with the value of the specialty, and hence inequalities of wealth and influence are developed. (4) Specialization also creates a need for co-ordination, and the co-ordinator must be given power and authority; thus hierarchy is created. (5) Differences of rank erect barriers to communication, and the more sharply defined these barriers become the greater is the interference with feelings of comradeship and *esprit de corps*.

The tremendous political appeal that the doctrine of a classless society has held for so many people is one example of the antipathy between the phenomena of caste and comradeship; and certainly a great part of the high morale associated with being an American is the feeling that each of us is as good as the next man, and that rank means very little. In short, democracy in human relationships, which most of us regard as a desirable thing, is impossible within a highly stable pattern of differentiated roles and functions. The most efficient organizations, from the standpoint of clearly fixed areas of responsibility, are those which, like a society of ants, are constructed on authoritarian lines. Each individual has his place, and the crossing of barriers is frowned upon. A democratic society, on the other hand, is a fluid thing, with a high degree of mobility allowed to the individual. Mobility and stability obviously cannot both be had in high degree. A measure of one can only be obtained at the partial expense of the other.

But these may seem like purely emotional reasons for opposing extensive specialization. Are there no others? There is, indeed, another extremely important reason, having nothing to do with sentimentality, but based on the facts of survival. One of the greatest dangers of a high state of specialization in any group or society is that of becoming overdependent on the specialists. As each of us concerns himself more and more with his own little bailiwick, and knows less and less about the work of the other man, we become totally dependent upon one another for the fulfillment of our basic needs. We are at the mercy of the doctor for the preservation of our health, the farmer for our food, the plumber for our heat and sanitation, and the automobile mechanic to get us to and from our work. If one of these specialists dies, decides to overcharge us for his services, or uses his monopoly of knowledge as a weapon to make the rest of us do his bidding, we are helpless unless we can either turn to another specialist or handle the problem ourselves. Many times there is no other specialist available in the particular group, organization, or community —or the specialists of one kind may have banded together for the achieve-

ment of selfish goals. It may not be that their motives are sinister. It may simply be that in the pursuit of their own self-interest they do not work in the best interests of others.

It would seem, then, that to be a member of a truly democratic group or society one must be a potential jack-of-all-trades. The only power that a citizen has over his political leaders, for example, is his ability to replace them. If none but a small group of professionals takes an interest in politics, and hence the small group obtains a monopoly of the know-how with which to handle public affairs, the citizen's control is for all practical purposes dissipated. By the same token, if the members of a discussion group know and learn nothing about the skills of leadership, their ability to preserve the group from the manipulation of an over-ambitious leader is seriously impaired. As Cicero once said:

> It has always seemed especially strange to me in the discourses of the learned, that men who admit that they cannot pilot the ship when the sea is calm, because they have never learned how nor troubled about such knowledge, nevertheless declare that they will take the helm when the waves are highest.[1]

To overspecialize roles and functions in a group or society is to create "indispensable men," with all the dangers which that philosophy entails. It may also eventually create men who, because their view of things is so myopic, may not even be able to communicate with one another. When that day arrives, either in small groups or in society at large, the social nature of man will have succeeded in choking itself to death.

[1] From *On the Commonwealth: Marcus Tullius Cicero*, trans. George H. Sabine and Stanley B. Smith, in *Readings in Political Philosophy*, ed. William Coker, rev. ed. (New York, 1948), p. 133.

COMMENTARY

By Gale E. Jensen

For the most part, I find Haiman's analysis both insightful and acceptable. To speculate about a possible analogy between small groups and large societies as a means of investigating the nature of specialization is interesting and worthwhile. Certainly if the analogy proves to be a good one, the chances of improving society through the utilization of small group experimental patterns of specialization are greatly increased. This in itself is no mean accomplishment.

Also, I find the identification and description of the three processes that produce specialization in groups to be good. It is one of the few attempts we have had to explain the "how" and "why" of specialization in groups.

The criticism of the Utterback "derivations" for specialization in discussion is quite sound. Not only does the "leader-as-process-specialist" position overlook the fact that "ends pre-exist in means," but, also, it does not seem to recognize that leader behavior based on this notion would provoke rather than prevent or alleviate interpersonal problems. With the possible exception of those highly dependent on (or coerced by) their leaders, there are no groups that permit methodological decisions and action to rest solely or primarily in the hands of the leader. Intuitively, if not consciously, group members recognize that the methodological decisions associated with a problem are equally as important as the substantive decisions. The "way" something is done is often more important to groups than "what" is done. Conflict in groups ensues just

as often over method as over substance or content. Even with highly dependent groups, it would be difficult for the leader to act as a "process specialist" because these groups have greater expectations for having the leader deal with problems in a substantive way.

It is when Haiman comes to his discussion on the deleterious effects of rigid and excessive specialization that I have some disagreement. I am not, however, in disagreement that rigid and the wrong kind of specialization will affect a group adversely. Rather I am in disagreement with the underlying notions about the nature of specializations that are present in the discussison. In brief, it is not so much that the analysis is "wrong" as that it is inadequate.

Two points are made. One, that extensive specialization causes individual satisfaction to fall. Second, that a high degree of specialization reduces chances for survival. The first point centers about the fact that as specialization increases rewards become unevenly distributed and a concentration of authority develops which leads to the formation of hierarchy and the creation of barriers to communication. That these things do happen and that they do decrease individual satisfaction is true. But we have no evidence that a negative functional, linear or otherwise, relationship necessarily exists between the degree of specialization and individual satisfaction. An uneven distribution of rewards according to some prestige hierarchy and a concentration of authority and power that creates barriers to communication and movement between roles are not inevitable results of greater specialization. This happens when some persons want and influence it to develop in this fashion. These phenomena are not the necessary result of specialization, but rather they occur because some persons organize and control the distribution of rewards, the flow of communication, and the mobility between roles in ways that tend to be especially beneficial to them.

The second point concerning "survival" overlooks the fact that a high degree of specialization, rather than creating "indispensable men," tends to create a high degree of interdependency in all men. While I may be the powerful, indispensable expert in one area of activity, I can well be a naive, helpless person in another. It is true the doctor at a particular time may hold my life in his hands and may make me pay well to preserve it. But certainly the man who services the doctor's complicated heating system in his home is as vital to the doctor as the doctor is to me. The ability to deprive or gratify tends to be an equalizer in whosever hands it happens to lie. With a high degree of specialization the ability to deprive or gratify because of a possessed specialization is likely to be more widely distributed than where a lesser degree of specialization exists. Stated otherwise, a high degree of specialization tends to create peer relations between people rather than those of great inequalities of power and indispensability.

Speaking in terms of group survival, a high degree of specialization tends to enhance chances for survival. Specialization is the path to greater security. It is the way to the development of knowledge and ways of action that increase man's chances to prevent his extermination. Specialization in most fields of inquiry and practice has been increased continuously during the last 2000 years. As specialization has increased, various forces that once threatened survival (such as disease and lack of food, hous-

ing, and adequate protection) have been greatly reduced. All this has been accomplished through greater and greater degrees of specialization. In fact a good case might be made for asserting that it is due to lack of specialization of some kind, rather than an overextension of it, that it is possible for some self-induced or external happenings to threaten our very existence.

COMMENTARY

By William E. Utterback

Dr. Haiman's distinction between two conceptions of specialization in roles and functions is sound and useful. According to one view, that to which he adheres, the group should make no assignment of specific responsibilities to any member of the group in connection with either process or substance, all members being left equally free to perform any or all functions as they feel inclined. According to the other view, the group should in advance of discussion delegate to one member the major responsibility for certain functions necessary to effective group process.

As Dr. Haiman associates the latter view with my name, I should like first to clarify my own position. My view involves, he says, two assumptions: (1) that attention to process and attention to the substance of discussion can be divorced, and (2) that all of the functions related to process can be performed by one person. I would not subscribe to either proposition without some qualification. Some of the functions related to group process certainly require that the moderator concern himself with substance—that, for example, in which he assists the group to resolve a conflict by probing with questions for the implied premises of an argument. The point is not that the moderator should have no concern with substance, but rather that he should not become a party to the argument by expressing his own opinion on the soundness of the views being presented. I would subscribe to the statement that one person can perform all of the functions related to group process, provided it is understood that other members of the group are also free to perform such functions if they wish. Often they do perform them, or some of them. The moderator's responsibility is only to see to it that the functions are performed, whether by himself or someone else.

To this clarification of my position I wish to add two further statements. One is that the assignment of process functions to a moderator is often temporary, holding for one session only or even for a portion of a session only. Indeed all members of the group may take a turn at it, provided that at any particular time all understand who has the major responsibility for process functions. The second statement is that assuming this responsibility does not authorize the moderator to impose his will on the group, even on procedural matters. His role is to remind and to suggest, not to dictate. When a moderator operates under these conditions, I do not fear that his services will destroy democracy by creating a permanent hierarchy of status within the group or will threaten group survival by making the moderator an "indispensable" man.

Which of the two conceptions of specialization in role and function is the sounder may depend on the nature of the group and the purpose of discussion. In a training situation, much can be said for depriving the group of the ser-

vices of a moderator. The resulting confusion and frustration may in themselves be instructive. And in some other situations where interest attaches primarily to the influence of discussion on the individual participant rather than to the group product, it may make little difference whether the group has a moderator.

But in action groups primary interest attaches to the group product, the objective of discussion being to reach as much agreement as possible on as sound a conclusion as possible in as short a time as possible. Here practical experience overwhelmingly supports the view that the services of a moderator improve the group product. Unfortunately adequate experimental evidence to verify the empirical judgment is lacking. Our next step should be to obtain evidence on the point.

REJOINDER

By F. S. Haiman

I find Gale Jensen's two points of disagreement with my article extremely thought-provoking, but not sufficiently convincing to cause me to alter greatly my original position.

He maintains that we have no evidence that specialization *necessarily* leads to hierarchy, concentration of authority, and barriers to communication, although he admits that this often or usually does happen. I would *like* to believe, with Jensen, that these strains in interpersonal relationships are not an inevitable consequence of specialization, but feel that the weight of both theory[1] and everyday observation is against us. This, it seems to me, places the burden of proof on those who would maintain that there is no necessary relationship. My hunch is that it would require an extensive program of re-education in order for people to achieve specialization without unequal value judgments being made, and to co-ordinate diverse activities without some concentration of authority.

Jensen's second point, that a high degree of specialization, rather than creating "indispensable men," develops interdependency in all men, is somewhat more persuasive to me. I must concede that I had looked upon the interpersonal flow of services too much as a one-way street—from the specialist to the "others"—ignoring the fact that the "others" also are specialists and can perhaps protect themselves against exploitation by virtue of the fact that they too have knowledge or skill which is needed. I believe that this is a more balanced view than that presented in my article, although I remain skeptical about the general validity of Jensen's hypothesis that "specialization tends to create peer relations between people."

As to his final argument, that "specialization is the path to greater security," I must vehemently dissent. Even if we grant his point that greater specialization makes possible greater control over the threatening forces of our environment, we cannot ignore its effect upon the internal system of a group or society. What good will it do us to conquer poverty and disease if, in the process, we lose our ability to talk with one another?

With Dr. Utterback's qualified statement of his position I find myself in less (though still substantial) disagreement than I thought I might. I am still troubled by his distinctions between

[1] Robert F. Bales, *Interaction Process Analysis* (Cambridge, 1950), pp. 71-84, 172-76.

process and substance, and by the leader's relationship to them. Permitting the leader to help "resolve a conflict by probing with questions," but denying him the privilege of "expressing his own opinion," strikes me as a rather clear indication that the leader, in Utterback's thinking, must see himself as being quite different from the ordinary members of the group. I am glad to note that he would *allow* other members of the group to perform leadership functions, but am disappointed that he apparently would not take active steps to *encourage* them to do so. I am also disturbed that he does not allow his leader, so long as he is in the chair, to play a membership role—even though the group may be quite mature and may have relieved him of most of his leadership responsibilities. Utterback's statement that at any particular time all members of a group must understand "who has the major responsibility for process functions" suggests to me a high degree of specialization to which I would object, for the reasons stated in my article.

I am pleased to find myself in agreement with Utterback on two of his last points. First, that the moderator-versus-no-moderator argument cannot be resolved without taking into account the nature and purpose of the discussion. And second, that more research is necessary before it can be asserted that, in action groups, "the services of a moderator improve the group product."

* * *

TELEVISION TRAINING: LIBERAL ARTS VERSUS PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL

Elwood A. Kretsinger

PRODUCTION of programs for television is one of the newest studies in the academic field of speech. Welcome as it is, however, there is some question where it had best be pursued. Can liberal arts colleges do as well with training in television as the professional schools can? In answering this question it might be well to consider first some of the advantages of offering this training in the professional school.

A major obstacle to television instruction is the high cost of equipment. Here it would appear that the professional school has the initial advantage. The school of journalism, for example, is accustomed to paying large sums for its presses, linotypes, teletypes, and photographic equipment. Schools of communication are accustomed to similar outlays. On the other hand, those who make up budgets for liberal arts departments appear to lack the independence and the experience best suited to handling such problems of expense as those involved in television training.

Another advantage in the professional school instruction lies in academic atmosphere. Those who teach television in pragmatic surroundings are almost certain to enjoy the more congenial situation. They do not associate so closely with the devotees of pure scholarship who view with raised eyebrows any field not sanctioned by antiquity and pride themselves on *not* owning television sets. There are not so many persons of this sort on the liberal arts faculty that the beleaguered television instructor cannot survive, but there are enough to plague him in staff meetings, on committees, and at the faculty club.

For the student, there is undoubtedly an immediate advantage in being affiliated with a professional school. Liaison with industry is likely to be close. Local and regional telecasters are likely to be acquainted with the professional school where as a matter of school policy they are often asked to lecture and to hold workshops. It is not surprising that an industry wishing to hire college graduates should turn first to such a school. For this reason the professional school is likely to attract more students than the liberal arts department of television. Despite the broad cultural purposes which colleges and universities profess to serve, survival of any instructional subject depends upon enrollment. Just as students and parents expect a tangible return for their tuition dollars, so do administrators expect a tangible return for their budgetary dollars.

Another advantage enjoyed by the professional school is that there the student may be served openly and directly. It is understood at the outset that he is preparing himself to take a place in the television industry. Therefore he may undertake without prejudice a considerable concentration in his chosen field. When television is taught in the liberal arts college, the student is limited in the number of courses he may take.

Elwood A. Kretsinger (Ph.D., University of Southern California, 1951) is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Oregon.

It is sometimes difficult to make him see the logic in foregoing a desired course in television production in order to take history, especially when he plans a career in television. It is, in fact, even difficult for the student's adviser to recommend certain courses in an outside area during a senior's last term when the student's immediate needs and desires appear to lie in another direction.

These advantages commonly credited to the professional school—ease in procuring equipment, academic atmosphere, better liaison with industry, and more intensive specialization—may not be the only ones, but they will serve for making comparisons between the two systems of training. What, then, can liberal arts offer by way of rebuttal?

Consider first the problem of obtaining adequate facilities for television training. It is true, perhaps, that administrators of departments of speech have been accustomed to thinking a tape recorder the most expensive training device to be purchased. Through the years, however—especially since World War II—it has become apparent that department heads in liberal arts colleges can spend the school's money as boldly as anyone else, provided the funds are available. In fact, toward the end of the fiscal year when unspent balances must return to some general fund, these men have been known to spend money with reckless abandon. Where is the head of a speech department who is loath to seek funds far in excess of any previous budget as long as he can present a strong case in support of the request? Liberal arts administrators, stunned as they might have been upon entering television's blue-chip game, appear to have rallied manfully.

One might also take a closer look at the matter of academic atmosphere when television is taught in the liberal arts program. There is no denying that every campus has its quota of militant humanists. Nor can one deny that television production, which is palpably concerned with technique, provides these humanists an attractive target. The television instructor, however, can take comfort in the knowledge that education for today's world cannot remain entirely free of immediate practicality. Education, as Everett Martin says, fails of its function when men are unable to retain its values while struggling with problems of work.[1] Nineteenth-century European concepts of education, by themselves, are inadequate to equip students with the knowledge requisite for life today. Examination of the average liberal arts curriculum will reveal that this truth has long been conceded. Too, it must be obvious that the humanities are immediately "practical" studies for those students planning to teach language, literature, and history, for example. Finally, it should be evident that everyone with a rightful place on a liberal arts faculty is committed to the values of humanistic education, and that it requires more conscientiousness and ingenuity to preserve these values in television than in the humanities themselves.

Regarding the immediate vocational advantage enjoyed by the student graduating from a professional school, it would seem that the liberal arts advocate has no reply other than to point out that the advantage is primarily just that—an immediate one. True, executives from the broadcasting industry have often assured college audiences that it is the student with the broad background of general knowledge whom the industry seeks. "Don't worry about tech-

[1] Everett D. Martin, *The Meaning of a Liberal Education* (Garden City, 1926), p. 161.

niques," they say. "We'll have to teach you our way of doing it, anyway." This sounds reassuring, but things do not seem to work out that way—at least in the smaller television operations where most students would expect to start. When a vacancy is to be filled, the station manager looks first to see if he can absorb the work within his own staff. Failing this, he checks the applications on file with an eye to persons already working somewhere in the industry. Probably the last place he will look will be on a liberal arts campus. When the chips are down, he wants the most thoroughly trained man he can find, and he wants him in a hurry. Of course, if the job in question is that of an usher or a receptionist, the manager is usually happy to make good on his "Don't worry about techniques. . . ." Nevertheless, on this point of immediate vocational advantage for the student, we must admit that the professional school has the better of it.

Now let us consider the worth of a limited offering of television courses in a liberal arts program. When compared with the impressive list of offerings in the professional school, television in liberal arts looks meager indeed. Even discounting the repetitive proliferation of the larger offering—"Television Studio Skills" followed by "Television Performance" followed by numerous seminars—there can be little question that a more intensive training in the theory and technique of television production is possible in the professional school. But, is real disservice done to the student when he is required to limit his specialized training in favor of more liberal course work? Consider, for example, his having to take history instead of another television course. Is it doing the student a disservice to point out that a great many people have contributed over a very long time to human knowledge and that, in consequence, this knowledge reveals the universals of mankind as no specialized course possibly could? Is it unfair to remind the student that while particular skills are needed today, in Siepmann's words, it is "dangerous to overlook the cultural significance of a liberal education as the necessary ballast for a civilized way of life"?[2] Should it not be made clear that the attributes of a liberally educated man—breadth of perspective, human insight, respect for excellence—are nowhere more essential than in the media of mass communications?

The gains made in the quality of network television programming since 1954 indicate what can happen when a single liberal mind exerts itself boldly. Sylvester (Pat) Weaver, until recently Chairman of the Board of NBC, accomplished in two years what grassroots "do gooders," educators, and even the FCC had been unable to do in eight. Weaver's idea for participating sponsorship of high-budget television programs effectively broke the advertising agencies' strangle hold on policy. It put control of programming back in the hands of the telecaster. Stimulating new formats such as "Today" and "Wide, Wide World" emerged as standards for the entire industry. It took more than courage for Weaver, who had previously been an agency man, to make this change in the face of the formidable threat: "Who . . . does he think he is? . . . I'll fight this to the death!"[3] It took more than a moralistic desire to do the "right thing." It took the conviction, born of early training in cultural val-

[2] Charles A. Siepmann, *Radio, Television and Society* (New York, 1950), p. 257.

[3] Thomas Whiteside, "Profiles: The Communicator, II . . . ," *The New Yorker*, XXX (October 23, 1954), 68.

ues, that mass enlightenment through exposure was a worthwhile gamble. That Weaver is no longer with NBC in no way vitiates his accomplishments. It is gratifying to note that his reforms survive.

One cannot say with certainty that Weaver would have been a different man with different ideals had he not spent four years at Dartmouth majoring in philosophy. It is difficult, however, to imagine any but a liberally educated man saying, "This show is not just about what the public wants to do but what you want them to do. . . . You *take* the American people to see the Greek drama, you *take* them to see 'King Lear' at Stratford, Ontario. It would be good for them to see Shakespeare, whether they liked it or not."[4]

It is not the purpose of this article to suggest that television training in a professional school precludes the possibility of a liberal education. Nor is it to suggest that training under a liberal arts program will insure such an education. It would seem, however, that preparation for television under a liberal discipline has, in the long run, a better *chance* of producing the kinds of men and women this vital medium deserves. If this is true, then every effort should be made to keep television in speech under a liberal philosophy, and if it must be lost, let it not go by default.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 73.

• • •

IN THE REGIONAL JOURNALS

Barnet Baskerville

I HAVE recently had an instructive and perhaps a unique experience. At the suggestion of the editor of *QJS*, I have read, article by article, all issues of the principal regional speech journals for 1956.[1] I presume that most of us are accustomed to nibble selectively at the bill of fare provided by the regional (and probably also the national) professional journals—sampling what takes our fancy or appeals to our taste. This is perhaps not altogether a bad thing, for a wholesale bolting of the entire menu, I find, can induce distressing indigestion caused not by lack of wholesomeness of the fare, but by the fact that there is so much that one's system is not equipped to assimilate.

But to extricate myself from a metaphor which is becoming unmanageable, and to come at the matter in another way, I must report that this adventure among the regional journals has been in part humiliating. I am by profession a teacher of speech, and I should be able to attend with a comprehending ear when other teachers of speech speak. Such, however, does not seem to be the case. The scope of the articles within this six-inch shelf of periodicals before me—a scope extending from a Greek approach to Pound's "Cantos" to a study of defective speech in cases of open-bite malocclusion — provides dramatic illustration of how much there is in one's own field that one knows little or nothing about. Indeed, as I look diagonally across the "field" to some esoteric and remote corner (remote, that is to say, from my own particular corner of specialization), I wonder what tenuous thread binds us together in the same academic discipline. And I find sometimes that I understand the language of the teacher of English or history more clearly than that of my colleague in speech, even as he no doubt finds it more profitable to listen to a friend in psychology or anatomy than to me. It is not my intention to draw any ominous inferences from these facts, but only to point out that they do seem to be facts.

My purpose in this article is to scout the regional journals for the readers of *QJS*, calling attention to items which have been particularly interesting and illuminating to me. The list will of course be selective, partly for the reason already indicated. No claim is made for completeness, nor is it suggested that the articles mentioned are the "best" of the year's offering. I will not go beyond saying that these are the items which, for one reason or another, have appealed to me and which I would call to the attention of those who may have overlooked them.

Rhetoric and Public Address

Since the year 1956 marked the centennial of Woodrow Wilson's birth, one

This article marks the first appearance of a feature which we propose to repeat from time to time if it proves interesting to our readers. The author, Barnet Baskerville, is Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Washington. He is a frequent contributor of articles and book reviews to QJS. *His most recent article,* "The New Nixon," *appeared in February 1957.*

[1] Editor's Note: Through the whimsicalities of mischance Mr. Baskerville was unable to secure copies of *Today's Speech* for 1956 in time to meet the Editor's deadline. He and the Editor express their regret and promise that in the next review Mr. Baskerville will give due consideration to that estimable journal.

might expect a number of Wilson papers. Strangely, none of the three national journals published a single article on this master of political and academic speaking. It is appropriate, therefore, to mention George C. Osborn's piece on "Woodrow Wilson as a Speaker" in the winter issue of the *Southern Speech Journal*. Mr. Osborn is a professor of social sciences, currently engaged in research for a full-length biography of Wilson. Although this article does not add notably to our knowledge about the speaking of Woodrow Wilson, it is of interest to examine the method of a "non-speech person" in analyzing the speaking of a statesman. I was surprised at its similarity to what has become almost a standard pattern of analysis among students of public address. Osborn deals systematically with such topics as: the education of the speaker (influence of parents, community, college, clubs, etc.), the man himself, his methods of preparation, style, delivery, rapport with audience. He draws to a remarkable degree upon such familiar sources as *QJS* (seven articles are cited), *Speech Monographs*, the Brigance studies, and even from an unpublished dissertation by Clair Henderlider. It will be interesting to see if Mr. Osborn's forthcoming biography will include a chapter on Wilson's speaking, and if it follows the general pattern of this essay.

Readers familiar with Tau Kappa Alpha's quarterly, *The Speaker*, will know of its section on Contemporary Public Address, edited during 1956 by Wayne Minnick. Although there is a tendency among writers of articles of this nature to bite off considerably more than can be chewed in the few pages available to them in a small journal, Theodore Clevenger's piece on some convention addresses of Alben Barkley (January) exemplifies a wise limitation of a field of discussion. In small compass it gives considerable insight into the nature of Barkley's particular contribution to American politics. And (unlike the idolatrous piece on Dulles in the May issue) it displays a fairly critical temper throughout.

The *Central States Speech Journal*, after some disastrously lean years, appeared in 1956 to be firmly back on its feet on a two-issues-a-year basis. Among the articles in public address, I found Edgar Willis' "College Orations Old and New" (Spring) particularly suggestive. Willis compares the orations delivered in Midwestern oratorical associations during the last twenty-five years with those presented before the turn of the century. In this very general treatment (there are only three or four specific examples) the writer notes differences in the nature of subjects discussed, changing fashions in language and style, and altered speaker-audience relationship. I confess a weakness for this kind of study, and perhaps my reaction will not be widely shared, but it seems to me that Mr. Willis was unduly modest in restricting his report to less than three pages. I think he has here one fairly significant index to that mysterious phenomenon, the "student mind," which is a fragment (albeit perhaps an infinitesimal one!) of a larger and equally mysterious entity, the American Mind. If Willis decides to develop this brief report into a longer article, extending his observations and illustrating his generalizations by specific references to the orations themselves, I can assure him of at least one loyal reader.

Also in the *CSSJ* for 1956 are two articles on ghostwriting. In the first, "Ghostwriting in Departments of the Federal Government" (Spring), R. W. Heinen gives a brief account of his own

adventures in governmental ghostwriting during fifteen years of service in the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Mr. Heinen makes the point that although it has long been accepted practice for an administrator to get staff assistance in drafting letters, reports, policy statements, budgets, and the like, when this same staff assistance is enlisted to help write a speech, it is labeled "ghostwriting" and dramatized as something unique. Yet, says Heinen, the man who drafts a budget statement for the administrator is as much a "ghostwriter" as the man who drafts a speech. Teachers of public speaking will find Mr. Heinen's firsthand observations informative, though few will agree with his conclusion that "teaching an understanding of 'ghostwriting' should be an essential part of any general college course in speech."

The second of these articles is "Ghostwriting in Presidential Campaigns" (*CSSJ*, Fall), by Robert Ray of the University of Iowa. Ray vigorously denies that there is anything evil or dishonest about a candidate's delivering a speech written by another. He justly points out that it is impossible for a presidential candidate to prepare unaided scores of speeches while at the same time attending to the many details involved in a modern campaign tour. I am willing to accept Mr. Ray's plea of necessity, but I am troubled by his easy dismissal of the charge that ghostwriting makes it possible for "certain interest groups" to manipulate a candidate "as a ventriloquist manages a puppet." Nor does it help much for Ray to assert that this suggests "cart before the horse" reasoning, that it implies that assistants hire the candidate instead of the reverse. Certainly the last few years have produced ample evidence that it is possible to package, praise, and sell almost anything—from a shampoo to an attitude toward a policy or program—with a minimum of specific reference to what lies inside the airtight, crushproof, aluminized, sanitized container. Is it not credible that a political candidate might also be merchandised? And what greater aid to such merchandising than a device which lets those who play your politicians "speak no more than is set down for them." But Mr. Ray has an answer to this, and these meanderings of mine do his article injustice. I hope it will be widely read and that it will lead some to further reflection and writing about this practice which, more and more, is complicating the task of the critic. I cannot resist one further observation. Mr. Ray urges the speech critic to investigate thoroughly the matter of authorship and the degree of assistance rendered by speech writers. To this I cry, "Amen," but add that such investigation is inevitably frustrated by dutifully self-effacing ghostwriters who insist that the candidate "really wrote his own speeches," because the end products (to use Mr. Ray's own words) reflected the "desired word arrangement, style, and intent" of the speaker. Now writing one's own speech is one thing, and delivering a speech written by someone else (no matter how much it may reflect *desired* qualities) is quite another, although this difference may be of no moment to anyone but a rhetorical critic.

I shall mention only one more item in the public address area.[2] For readers who have had difficulty in composing an intelligible impromptu reply to the

[2] There are two other articles which I should like to comment upon: Hugh Nibley's "Victoriosa Loquacitas" (*WS*, Spring), and Malcolm Sillars' "The New Conservatism and the Teacher of Speech" (*SSJ*, Summer). I shall resist the impulse, however, since I understand that "replies" to these articles are being prepared for publication.

question "What is semantics, anyhow?" I recommend David Rynin's "Semantics" (*Western Speech*, Winter), a paper read to the Kosmos Club of the University of California faculty. After differentiating semantics as he understands it from "general semantics," Rynin defines the term as "the theory of meaning of linguistic signs," and then proceeds to discuss some meanings of "meaning." Although apparently intended as an exposition for those working in other fields, this thoughtful discussion will be helpful to most teachers of speech.

Theatre

As one whose personal contact with the theatre has been limited to a single performance as Cappy Ricks in my high-school senior play (to which characterization I brought nothing beyond a very loud voice), I have been surprised to discover how many articles on the drama have caught and held my attention. The first article I came upon in this survey of the journals, and one of the best, was Hubert Heffner's "On Producing the Classics" (*CSSJ*, Spring). Mr. Heffner asserts that "the academic theatre can, and to a large extent has, become the home of the classical drama in America." He believes that academic training in theatre and drama (he insists that the two must be taken together), based upon the study and staging of the classics, is an important avenue toward a liberal education. But he raps sharply the practice of exploiting students' time and talents by pushing them into one extracurricular show after another, to the detriment of their academic studies. This, he affirms, is *not* a part of a liberal educational program and should not be tolerated in a reputable college or university. Would that this message might be preached in schools of drama who have not heard the gospel—or who, having heard, heed it not.

Another article, though of quite a different kind, is "The Boy Man: A Character Type," by Lowell Matson (*CSSJ*, Fall). Matson calls attention to the constant recurrence in contemporary drama of the boy-man ("a character outwardly endowed with manliness, and inwardly compelled by childishness"). He produces an impressive gallery of boy-men, mainly from the plays of Tennessee Williams, William Inge, and Arthur Miller. He notes also "the development of a pool of talent admirably equipped temperamentally and physically to play the roles," the more recent of whom are such actors as Marlon Brando, James Dean, and Ralph Meeker. All of this makes sprightly reading, but Matson's hasty, halfhearted attempt in his three final paragraphs to account for the prevalence of this phenomenon falls far short. I wish he had pursued this inquiry farther.

The entire Summer issue of *Western Speech* is devoted to a symposium on "Problems in Acting." Guest editor Garff Wilson brings together five excellent articles on acting by F. Cowles Strickland, Barnard Hewitt, Jonathan Curvin, Francis Hodge, and E. J. West. This is an experiment by editor Don Geiger, who registered his conviction that this is one kind of publication which a regional journal is uniquely equipped to provide. Whereas the national journal can scarcely turn over an entire issue to a single area of speech, or to a single problem, the regional journal can and perhaps occasionally should. It is valuable to have such a group of related articles under one cover for ready reference or for use in graduate seminars. Geiger (who is succeeded by Don Hargis) planned two subsequent symposia, one in speech correction and one in public address.

Miscellaneous

Finally, I should like to call attention to three articles which are representative of a type that frequently appears in our professional journals, both local and national, namely the examination of various aspects of the speech curriculum, usually for the purpose of attack or defense. The tone of these articles (though not necessarily of the three I shall mention below) ranges from devastating self-censure to a self-defense that is downright aggressive, and must cause outsiders to observe that it doth protest too much. They are perhaps most useful within the family, however, as a means of putting our own house in order, rather than as a means of converting the heathen. As for the heathen, I should prefer that they come to know us through our works rather than through our protestations.

I have already mentioned Hubert Heffner's eloquent statement of the case for training in theatre and drama as an avenue towards a liberal education. In the anniversary issue of *The Gavel* (March; celebrating the 50th anniversary of the founding of Delta Sigma Rho), A. Craig Baird makes a similar case for the course in argumentation. After reviewing some of the literature relating to the nature and aims of general education, Mr. Baird comes to the conclusion that the objectives "turn out to be . . . the goals and methods long familiar to college students of argument and their instructors." He enumerates five goals proclaimed by the proponents of general education and relates them to training in argumentation. Courses in argument, discussion, and debate, he concludes, "because they stress for their subject-matter current problems, because their methodology is that of analysis and synthesis, critical thinking, and communication, because they are a catalyst in unifying knowledge and training in decision, should have high rank by administrators and full support by speech and other departments." They do not, of course, and the reason is no doubt to be sought in one (or both) of two directions: their goals are not understood by administrators and other departments, or their goals are not always those described by Baird.

In contrast to Baird's calm assurance regarding the value of training in argumentation is the concern expressed by Henry L. Ewbank, Jr. regarding emphases in the teaching of public speaking. He is not worried about a return to the excesses of the "bellowcutionist," but warns that we may be "emphasizing the conversational mode and audience psychology above the necessity for saying something worth listening to." ("On the Ethics of Teaching Speech Content," *GSSJ*, Fall) "Our ethical position as teachers of speech," says Ewbank, "is secure only when we treat content as equal in importance to other elements of rhetoric." The only remarkable thing about such a thesis is that it should be published in a speech journal in the year 1956. One had hoped that such a statement would by this time have become axiomatic, like the proposition that the world is round. If not, it certainly should be repeated at intervals—and emphatically, as Mr. Ewbank has done here.

Another bit of professional introspection is engaged in by Otis Walter in "A Note on Breadth in Graduate Study in Rhetoric" (*SSJ*, Fall). Walter opens up an old wound—the tendency toward superficiality and specialization among rhetoricians. He reminds us once again that the greatest rhetoricians were also philosophers, and that if rhetoric is to be more than mere cookery, present-day rhetoricians must be philosophers too.

This will come as news to no one, and it is doubtful that many (save those few among us whose chief aim is to accumulate trophies for winning forensic contests) will disagree. Since rhetoric borrows from other fields of learning, the student of rhetoric must be conversant with these other fields—this basic theme of Walter's is self-evident. He is, I think, far too pessimistic when he says, "With rhetoric so dependent on other fields, the mystery is not why rhetorical training must be broad, but why comparatively few appear to have seen that it must be so."

The difficulty is not, it seems to me, that we do not see that it must be so. We do. And the hopelessness of the undertaking causes us to lose heart. We agree in principle with Walter that we should know more of logic than can be learned from an elementary text in argumentation, that we should know infinitely more than we do of psychology, philosophy, history, literature, and ethics. Not only must the professor of speech be a specialist in rhetoric, but he must have a more than casual acquaintance with the specialties of others. This is an obligation imposed to a comparable extent on no other member of the college faculty.

It is all very well to point out that Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, and Bacon were philosophers. But they didn't live among, and compete with, a society of specialists. I believe it was Frank Moore Colby who observed that at the present state of knowledge "universality" is just another word for scatterbrains. We rhetoricians, made acutely aware of our limitations by the strictures of others and by our own self-flagellation, find such brains as we have, scattered broadcast over half a dozen disciplines. It almost seems at times as if we are Jacks-of-everybody's-trade and masters not even of our own.

Lest all this be interpreted as a defense of specialization or an objection to Mr. Walter's premise, I should say emphatically that it is not so intended. It is simply a circuitous way of suggesting that "the fault, dear Walter, is not altogether in ourselves, but in our stars."

But this scouting tour of the journals must be brought to an end. I am left with the general impression that the regional journals are getting better. I have, however, been surprised to find relatively few pieces of the kind one might consider most appropriate to small journals primarily regional in circulation—articles of regional interest, for example, such as the history of the Southern Speech Association recently carried in the *SSJ;* or articles of limited scope, such as the report of a single speech situation; or the type of article referred to by the editor of *QJS* as "This is how we do it at Siwash" pieces, which often have some point but ought usually to be rejected by the larger journals. There are, I think, too many condensed and truncated treatments of subjects which should properly be discussed at greater length. There is often a need for more careful proofreading: it must be irritating to find one's brainchild titled "Sematics" for four consecutive pages; and the former president of a distinguished educational institution must have been furious to find himself saying in print, "There is always at least two sides to a question." But these perhaps are only quibbles. There can be no question that the small regional journals, under the direction of competent editors who insist (in the face of what I understand are often tremendous odds) upon keeping the quality high, can continue to be valuable supplements to—and in no odious sense overflows from—the national speech journals.

THE PRESIDENT'S PAGE

Loren Reid
President, SAA

Last summer I sat at a luncheon table with thirty teachers of speech, representing perhaps twenty different campuses. After the luncheon each of us reported briefly new developments in his department. Nearly everybody, however, prefaced his report with an appeal for help in filling vacancies.

Everywhere I meet the problem of shortage of teachers. At the Chicago convention serious candidates for positions each interviewed eight or ten appointing officers. This situation will be repeated at the Boston convention in August. What we need, therefore, is a large increase in the supply of teachers of speech—well-trained holders of bachelor's, master's, and doctor's degrees. A thousand more teachers than will be graduated this spring and summer could probably be placed without a murmur.

Every high-school speech teacher should talk frequently to his classes about the need for teachers. Start by reminding students that the number of babies being born in this country has passed the 4,000,000-per-year mark. Such a prodigious rate means that by the time you dismiss your class 400 brand-new future pupils have arrived. Note that starting salaries for teachers compare fairly well, though not well enough, with starting salaries in other fields. Comment also that the strong demand is sure to push teachers' salaries even higher. Between times say something about ideals, and the advantages (disadvantages, too) that belong distinctly to teaching.

One September after interviewing several hundred freshmen and noting that many of them had already decided to become accountants, I concluded that the teachers of commercial subjects had frankly called special attention to the growing demand for people in that profession. As I believe that every profession needs to do a certain amount of recruiting, I commend the commercial-subjects teachers and urge our teachers to tell their youngsters about careers in speech, speech pathology, and drama.

College and university teachers should also discuss with their students the profession of the professor. Describe what a graduate program of studies is like. Suggest that students take certain courses not only in speech, but also in language, statistics, history, literature, science, art, etc., to help prepare them for graduate study. Offer specific advice about securing scholarships or graduate assistantships.

It was often called to my attention, as Executive Secretary of SAA, that a high school teacher might build a strong speech program—only to see it vanish when he left, because his superintendent could not locate a successor. College and university departments likewise suffer when they lose a good teacher and cannot find a replacement. Our profession needs today a thousand more teachers: from ten to thirty in each of the forty-eight states, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and various overseas establishments. The demand will continue. Each individual teacher can help augment the future supply by discussing the problem with his own students in his own classroom.

THE FORUM

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA EXCERPTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Hotel Conrad Hilton, Chicago 26-29 December 1956

President Lester Thonssen . . . announced that several items had been added to the agenda after their distribution, the first of which was the reading of memorial tributes to SAA members who have died since the last annual meeting. H. A. Wichelns read the memorial to James A. Winans. Thonssen read Ross Scanlan's tribute to A. M. Drummond. Orville Hitchcock read the memorial to E. C. Mabie. Jack Bender read the memorial to Valentine B. Windt. Thonssen read the tribute to Richard C. Reager prepared by David Lilien.

Thonssen reported that after consultation with the Second Vice-President and the Executive Secretary he had appointed Wayne N. Thompson as Clerk of the Legislative Assembly. He also reported Thompson's acceptance of the appointment.

Hance submitted the report of the Executive Vice-President, moving that the SAA accept the invitation of the Executive Committee of the Council on Co-operation in Teacher Education of the American Council on Education to become a member association of that organization. Wallace seconded. Motion passed.

Braden moved that the SAA authorize University Microfilms to reproduce all volumes of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* prior to 1939 and the first five volumes (1934-1939) of *Speech Monographs*, making the reproductions available by 1 July, 1957. Hance seconded. Motion passed.

Howell submitted the report of the Editor of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, moving that the Administrative Council send a resolution of thanks to each of the following persons, expressing the gratitude of SAA for the services specified:

1. To Mr. Arthur E. Fox, Assistant to the President, Princeton University, for his help in securing an editorial office and office furnishings for the QJS during its second sojourn on the Princeton campus.
2. To Professor Carlos Baker, Chairman of the Department of English, Princeton University, for his generosity in making available from funds at his disposal the sum of $2,662 for use by the present Editor in securing secretarial assistance during his editorship; and also for his generosity in allowing the present Editor a time-allowance on his academic schedule during the last three years for the discharge of editorial duties.
3. To Mrs. Jeremiah S. Finch, Joseph Henry House, Princeton, New Jersey, for her valued assistance in reading proof on each issue of the QJS during the present editorial regime, and thus in protecting the Journal against errors that otherwise would have crept into its pages.
4. To Mrs. John A. Winterbottom, 80 Erdman Avenue, Princeton, New Jersey, for her tremendous help in presiding over the editorial office of the QJS between February, 1954, and December, 1956, and for her patience and skill in performing the many irksome duties that are necessary if the quality of the QJS is to be maintained at a high level.
5. To Mr. Nelson Heath Meriwether, Artcraft Press, 10 Watson Place, Columbia, Missouri, for his unfailing cheerfulness and great skill in helping the Editor to give the SAA an attractively printed journal.

Dickey seconded. Motion passed.

Johnson moved that the meetings of the 1956 Legislative Assembly be regarded as organization meetings for next year, that all actions taken by it be regarded as legal by the Administrative Council, and that the terms of members elected to the Assembly by the membership be assumed to begin on 1 January, 1957. Willis seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Rahskopf submitted a supplementary report for the Committee on Consultation, recommending that Maryland Wilson's proposal "that this Association establish types or degrees of memberships for individuals and categories for institutions offering degrees in Speech" be referred to the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards for study and recommendation and that the Committee give first consideration to the establishment of levels

of membership for individuals with appropriate qualifications and standards. McGlon moved acceptance of the recommendation. Robinson seconded. Motion passed.

In regard to the moving of a member of the Legislative Assembly from one region to another, McGlon moved that election to the Legislative Assembly constitutes the member a representative of the Association and not of a geographical area, so that moving from one region to another does not negate membership in the Legislative Assembly. Hicks seconded. Motion carried.

Sattler submitted a supplementary report of the Committee on Publications, recommending that the Committee be authorized to study further the feasibility of the publication of a comprehensive bibliography of specialized areas in speech and to solicit the cooperation of ASHA and AETA in the preparation and distribution of the bibliography. He moved acceptance of the recommendations. Auer seconded. Motion passed.

Wallace submitted the report of the Committee to Investigate the Feasibility of Taking Space in the NEA Building in Washington, recommending that (1) SAA not locate its permanent headquarters in the NEA Building, (2) that the Council now decide to establish headquarters incorporating the following features:

a. Location in the environment of a college or university which has a strong department of speech.
b. Connection with the educational institution which would help to acquire office supplies and equipment, property for rent or purchase, etc.
c. Employment of a full-time Executive Secretary or an arrangement by which the institution and SAA share the duties and salary of the Executive Secretary in a ratio of 1:2 or 1:3
d. A building to be acquired by rent, purchase, or construction, and (3) that to carry out the second recommendation the Council appoint the present committee with Auer as Chairman and instruct it to present specific and final recommendations at the convention in August, 1957.

Wallace moved acceptance of the first recommendation. Hicks seconded. Motion passed. Wallace moved acceptance of the second recommendation. Hicks seconded. Motion passed. Wallace moved acceptance of the third recommendation. Willis seconded. Motion passed.

Carr submitted a petition to establish an Interest Group for Speech for Foreign and Bilingual Students. McGlon moved acceptance. Hance seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Gunderson submitted the report of the Sub-Committee on a Volume of Studies of the Speaking of the Age of the Great Revolt, 1870-1898, of the Study Committee on the History of American Public Address, requesting that the Council authorize the Sub-Committee as a Project Committee. Constans moved the requested authorization. Wallace seconded. Motion passed.

EXCERPTS FROM MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING

29 December, 1956

President Thonssen introduced the new President, Loren Reid, surrendering the gavel to him.

Hance moved that the Association go on record as expressing its appreciation of the services of the retiring officers and editors and express that appreciation more tangibly in letters to them and the institutions they represent.[9] Wallace seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Hance moved that we express our appreciation to Reid for his excellent work in planning the current convention program and to Hahn for her leadership in presiding at the first meetings of the Legislative Assembly. Dickens seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

McGlon presented the following report of the Convention Committee on Resolutions:

WHEREAS, the Speech Association of America assembled in annual convention from 26 through 29 December, 1956, in Chicago, Illinois, has enjoyed comfortable accommodations, friendly service, and cordial co-operation on the part of the management of the Conrad Hilton Hotel, represented especially by Mr. James Collins; and

WHEREAS, the Chicago Convention Bureau has provided helpful counsel and materials; and

WHEREAS, the members of General Convention Committee, assisted by the Committees on Breakfasts, Lunches and Dinners, on Hospitality, on Information, on Publicity, on Special Events, on Registration, on Equipment, and on Ushers, expended unusual time and energy in fulfilling their specific duties; and

WHEREAS, First Vice-President Loren Reid coordinated the various parts of the program with consummate skill and imperturbable good humor; and

WHEREAS, the American Educational Theatre Association, the National Society for the Study

of Communication, the National University Extension Association, the American Forensic Association, and other related organizations have again demonstrated a commendable spirit of co-operation in our professional community; and

WHEREAS, the continued significance of the Association has been due in large part to the crisp urbanity of Lester Thonssen, the prudent frugality of Waldo Braden, the fastidious evaluation of Wilbur Samuel Howell, and the forthright sapience of J. Jeffery Auer, as well as to the endless hours of dedicated work on the part of all the retiring officers;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Speech Association of America recognizes its indebtedness to the aforementioned people and organizations; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Executive Secretary of the Speech Association of America be directed to send copies of this resolution to each person involved and to the institution represented as an expression of thanks from the Association.

Before adjournment, the President allowed Elizabeth B. Carr "one word": "Aloha," meaning, "Hello," "Good-bye," "I love you," and "I will miss you." She presented leis to Reid, Thonssen, Hahn, Hance, Braden, and Dietrich.

SUMMARY OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Hotel Conrad Hilton
Chicago
26 December, 1956

The first meeting was called to order at 11:25 by Elise Hahn, Second Vice-President.

Memorial resolutions were read, seconded, and passed unanimously, for Richard C. Reager, Alexander M. Drummond, Edward C. Mabie, Valentine B. Windt, and James Albert Winans. The entire Assembly stood for a moment of silence.

The Chairman appointed a Nominating Committee consisting of Hugh F. Seabury, Jesse J. Villarreal, Susie S. Niles, Maurice E. Swanson, and Robert G. Gunderson.

Elwood Murray moved that the Committee be instructed to bring in at least two names for each position. Seconded. Passed.

Reports were received and filed for the Committee on Publications, the Consultation Committee, and the Committee on Committees.

Waldo W. Braden reported that Magdalene Kramer, Loren Reid, Karl F. Robinson, and H. P. Constans had already been named to the SAA Nominating Committee.

Both Magdalene Kramer and Wilbur E. Gilman stated that the thought behind the formation of the Legislative Assembly was that any member should feel free to speak at any time on any topic.

A motion to recess until two o'clock was carried by acclamation.

The second meeting of the Legislative Assembly was held jointly with the Executive Committee, beginning at 2:25, with Lester Thonssen, President of the SAA, presiding.

Thonssen announced that the members of the Legislative Assembly, chosen at large or by geographical areas, were serving only on an organizational basis and that their terms should begin on 1 January, 1957.

Orville A. Hitchcock, Chairman of the Finance Committee, made his report. The Executive Secretary, Waldo W. Braden, made a detailed statement concerning the financial status of the Association.

Bower Aly moved that the Assembly extend a rising vote of thanks to Waldo W. Braden. Passed by acclamation.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05.

The third meeting of the Legislative Assembly was called to order at 3:15 by the Second Vice-President, Elise Hahn.

Jesse J. Villarreal, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, reported that the nominees for the SAA Nominating Committee were Elwood Murray and Frederick W. Haberman. A vote was taken and Frederick W. Haberman was elected.

Reports were accepted for the Committee on Co-operation between the Regional Associations, the Committee on Contemporary Public Address, the Committee on International Discussion and Debate, the Committee on Archives, and the Committee on Recruitment and Supply.

The Legislative Assembly, on a motion by Wilbur E. Gilman, interpreted the Constitution as meaning that members elected to the Legislative Assembly shall begin their terms of service the January first following their election.

The Legislative Assembly referred to the Executive Committee the question of the status of members chosen from geographical areas and moving from those areas before their terms of membership in the Legislative Assembly expire.

The meeting recessed at 4:05.

The fourth meeting of the Legislative Assembly was called to order at 7:45 with the Second Vice-President, Elise Hahn, presiding.

The Chairman of the Nominating Committee presented his report in three sections, and following each report a vote was taken. The Assembly elected the following as members of the Executive Committee to represent the geographical areas: Southern, Douglas Ehninger and Sara Lowrey; Central, N. Edd Miller and Carrie Rasmussen; Eastern, Carroll C. Arnold and Eleanor M. Luse; Western, William B. McCoard and Donald E. Hargis.

The Assembly elected as members of the Executive Committee representing Interest Groups the following: Charlotte I. Lee, Forest L. Whan, George V. Bohman, and John V. Irwin.

The Assembly elected as members of the SAA Committee on Committees Mary Louise Gehring, William S. Howell, and Margaret L. Wood.

The Assembly received the reports of the Committee on the History of Public Address; the Committee on Problems in Graduate Study; the Committee on Problems in Motion Pictures and Visual Aids; the Speech Association of the Eastern States; the Southern Speech Association; the Central States Speech Association; the Western Speech Association; the Interest Group in Administrative Policies and Practices; the American Forensic Association; the Interest Group in Professional and Business Speaking; the Interest Group in General Semantics; the Interest Group in Discussion and Group Methods; the Interest Group in High School Discussion and Debate; the Interest Group in the History of Speech Education; the Interest Group in Voice, Phonetics, and Linguistics; the Interest Group in Interpretation; the Interest Group in Parliamentary Procedure; the Interest Group in Personal and Social Psychology; the Interest Group in Rhetoric and Public Address; the Interest Group in Speech and Hearing Disorders; the Interest Group in Speech in the Elementary School; the Interest Group in Speech in the Secondary School; the Interest Group in Undergraduate Speech Instruction; the Interest Group in Speech for Religious Workers; the Interest Group in Radio, Films, and Television; and the Pacific Speech Association.

J. Calvin Callaghan moved that the Legislative Assembly endorse the code referred to in the third paragraph of the report of the Speech Association of the Eastern States. Seconded. Palmer moved that the motion be tabled. Seconded. Passed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15.

REPORT ON ELECTION OF 1957 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

On the first ballot for the 1957 Nominating Committee, the results were as follows: total votes cast, 1,345; persons receiving more than ten votes, 21; persons receiving five or more votes, 59; different persons receiving votes, 771; persons receiving one vote, 253. Those selected were the following:

Carroll C. Arnold
H. P. Constans
Milton Dickens
Wilbur E. Gilman
Frederick W. Haberman
Marie Hochmuth
Magdalene Kramer
Elwood Murray
Robert T. Oliver
Loren Reid
Karl F. Robinson
Hugh F. Seabury

On the second ballot, 1,576 valid votes were cast for the twelve candidates. In tabulating the votes by the Hare system of proportional representation, the following three persons were selected for the 1957 Nominating Committee:

Magdalene Kramer, *Columbia University*
Loren Reid, *University of Missouri*
Karl F. Robinson, *Northwestern University*

At the 1956 Convention, the Administrative Council selected H. P. Constans, University of Florida, and the Legislative Assembly selected Frederick W. Haberman, University of Wisconsin, as the other members of the Committee.

COMMITTEES FOR 1957

The chairman of each committee is listed first.

Advisory Committees

Committee on Committees: Lester Thonssen, Loren Reid, Donald C. Bryant, John E. Dietrich, Howard Gilkinson, Kenneth G. Hance, Henry L. Mueller, Elise Hahn, Owen M. Peterson, Mary Louise Gehring, William S. Howell, Margaret Wood (the last three were elected by the Assembly).

Finance: Orville A. Hitchcock (Chairman until June 30, 1958), Karl R. Wallace, Kenneth G. Hance, Owen M. Peterson.

Publications: William M. Sattler (1 year), John E. Dietrich (2 years), T. Earle Johnson (3 years), Howard Gilkinson, Donald C. Bryant, Henry L. Mueller, Kenneth G. Hance, Owen M. Peterson.

Time and Place: Rupert L. Cortright (1 year), Milton Dickens (2 years), Magdalene Kramer (3 years), Owen M. Peterson.

Public Relations: Earl Ryan (1 year), N. Edd Miller (2 years), Elise Hahn, Kenneth G. Hance, Owen M. Peterson.

Consultation Committee: Lionel Crocker, H. P. Constans, Karl R. Wallace, Thomas A. Rousse, Lester Thonssen, Kenneth G. Hance, Owen M. Peterson.

Co-ordinating Committees

Committee on Co-operation between SAA and Other Related Organizations: Elise Hahn, James Carrell, Kenneth Harwood, Annabel D. Hagood, Frank Whiting.

Committee on Co-operation between SAA and Regional Associations: Kenneth G. Hance and the presidents of CSSA, WSA, SSA, SAES, PSA.

Service Committees

Contemporary Public Address: Harold F. Harding, John W. Bachman, A. Craig Baird, Milton Dickens, Frederick W. Haberman, Robert C. Jeffrey, N. Edd Miller, Ralph Richardson, Gordon L. Thomas, Eugene E. White, Thomas Daly (Consultant, *Vital Speeches*).

International Discussion and Debate: Franklin R. Shirley, Paul A. Carmack, Wayne C. Eubank, Annabel D. Hagood, Brooks Quimby. (Consultant from Institute on International Education to be appointed.)

Committee on Archives: L. LeRoy Cowperthwaite, J. Jeffery Auer, Owen M. Peterson, Earl W. Wiley.

Committee on Recruitment and Supply: Karl F. Robinson, Evelyn Konigsberg, Leroy T. Laase, Virginia Miller, Wanda B. Mitchell, Waldo Phelps, David C. Phillips, Hugh F. Seabury.

Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate: Glen E. Mills will be the SAA representative until January, 1959. The other members of the committee are representatives of TKA, PKD, DSR, PRP, and AFA. The chairmanship rotates.

Study Committes

Problems in Graduate Study: H. P. Constans, Claude E. Kantner, Franklin H. Knower, Charles W. Lomas, Horace G. Rahskopf.

Problems in Audio-Visual Materials for Teaching: Karl F. Robinson, John E. Dietrich, Clarence Flick, Harold F. Nelson, David Potter.

Problems in Teaching Speech in the Armed Forces: Joseph H. Mahaffey, George F. Batka, Clair R. Henderlider, James H. McBath, Eugene E. Myers.

Project Committees

Volume of Studies of Public Address on the Issue of Anti-Slavery and Disunion, circa VRFO;: J. Jeffery Auer, A. Craig Baird, Henry L. Ewbank, Sr.

Volume of Studies in the Colonial Period of American Public Address: George V. Bohman, Dallas C. Dickey, Ernest J. Wrage.

Volume of Studies in Southern Oratory: Dallas C. Dickey, J. Jeffery Auer, Waldo W. Braden, Lindsey S. Perkins.

Volume of Studies on the Speaking of the Age of the Great Revolt, 1870-98: Lindsey S. Perkins, Robert G. Gunderson, Hollis L. White.

Committees of the Legislative Assembly

Commitee on Credentials: David C. Phillips, C. C. Bender, Geraldine Garrison, Eleanor M. Luse, Wayne N. Thompson.

Committee on Resolutions: Robert C. Jeffrey, Wofford G. Gardner, Leland M. Griffin, Paul D. Holtzman, Paul A. Kozelka.

Ad Hoc Committees

Committee for Assistance to Foreign Universities: Martin Bryan, James W. Abel, Leslie Kreps, Jeanne C. Miles, Robert T. Oliver, William Schwab.

Committee on Awards: W. Charles Redding, J. Jeffery Auer, Paul D. Bagwell, Waldo W. Braden, James W. Brock, Paul A. Carmack, Rupert L. Cortright, William S. Howell, John W. Keltner.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Resolved, That the Constitution of the Speech Association of America, Article IX, The Legislative Assembly, be amended as follows:

To add to Section 1 the words:

"(6) the Second Vice-President-Elect from date of certification of election by the Executive Secretary until date of elevation to office of Second Vice-President."

To insert in Section 6 the words:

"the Second-Vice-President-Elect," after the word, "Parliamentarian."

The effect of this amendment is to make the Second Vice-President-Elect a member of the Legislative Assembly and of its Executive Committee.

This amendment was passed by the Legislative Assembly and the Administrative Council at their meetings in Chicago, December, 1956. Final action on the proposed amendment will be submitted to the membership by means of a printed ballot.

AMENDMENTS TO THE BY-LAWS

Change in Nominating Committee

Amend Article III, Section 3 of the By-Laws as follows:

By adding to the first sentence the following words: "none of whom shall be an officer of the Association or shall have been a member of the Nominating Committee for the preceding four years," so that the amended sentence shall read: "The Nominating Committee shall consist of five members of the Association, none of whom shall be an officer of the Association or shall have been a member of the Nominating Committee for the preceding four years." By amending the first sentence of the second paragraph by striking out the words "who has not served on the committee during the previous two years" and inserting the words "other than an officer of the Association or a member who has served on the Nominating Committee during the previous four years," so that the amended sentence shall read: "Each member of the Association may nominate for the Nominating Committee one person, other than an officer of the Association or a member who has served on the Nominating Committee during the previous four years."

Change in Dues

Amend Article I, Section 3 of the By-Laws as follows:

By striking out the figure "$4.50" in the sentence beginning "The dues shall be $4.50 a year," and substituting the figure $5.50 in its stead, the change to take effect January 1, 1958.

Creating Memorial Memberships

Amend Article I, Section 1, of the By-Laws to read as follows:

Section 1. There shall be seven classes of membership in the Association: student, regular, sustaining, institutional, emeritus, life, and memorial.

Amend Article I, Section 7 to read as follows:

Section 7. Any member making a contribution to the Trust Funds of the Association of such amounts as the Administrative Council shall prescribe shall become a Regular Life Member, and shall have throughout life the privileges of a regular member. Any member making a contribution to the Trust Funds of the Association of such amounts as the Administrative Council shall prescribe shall become a Sustaining Life Member, and shall have throughout life the privileges of a sustaining member.

Add to Article I a Section 8:

Section 8. Any person or group making a contribution to the Trust Funds of the Association of $1500.00 shall be the founder of a Memorial Membership. The contribution shall be maintained in perpetuity as a trust. The person or group establishing a Memorial Membership shall be entitled to designate the name by which it shall be known, shall be entitled to designate the person who shall hold this membership throughout life, and shall be entitled to provide a mode of selecting future life tenants of this membership.

Make these corrections in Article I:

Change the number of the present Section 8 to "Section 9."

Change the number of the present Section 9 to "Section 10."

Change the number of the present Section 10 to "Section 11."

Emeritus Membership

Substitute the following for Article I, Section 6 of the By-Laws:

Any member who has been permitted to retire by his institution because of age or disability and who has held continuous membership in the Speech Association of America for twenty-five years shall be granted an Emeritus membership and shall be exempt from the payment of the annual dues and shall have throughout life all the privileges of a regular member.

If membership in the Association has not been continuous, a total of thirty years of membership is required for Emeritus membership.

The Executive Secretary, either on his own initiative or on the recommendation of a member of the Association who can supply the necessary information, shall present the name of any eligible member to the Administrative Council and to the Legislative Assembly at the convention immediately preceding the date of eligibility, or at any convention thereafter.

Upon the recommendation of a member of the Council or of the Asembly and upon the unanimous vote of both the Council and the Assembly, Emeritus membership may be granted to a retired member of the Association whose service to the profession has been unusual but who has not been a member of the Association for twenty-five years.

OFFICERS OF INTEREST GROUPS ELECTED AT 1956 CONVENTION AT CHICAGO

Administrative Policies and Practices
Chairman: Leroy T. Laase
Vice-Chairman: James Henning
Secretary: Clarence W. Edney
Advisory Committee: Karl R. Wallace, Klonda Lynn, Horace G. Rahskopf
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: F. Lincoln D. Holmes

American Forensic Association
Chairman: Annabel D. Hagood
Vice-Chairman: Robert Newman
Secretary: Malcolm Sillars
Advisory Committee: Austin Freeley, Paul Carmack, William S. Howell

Business and Professional Speaking
Chairman: Thomas L. Dahle
Vice-Chairman: Harold P. Zelko
Secretary: Harold O. Haskitt, Jr.
Advisory Committee: James N. Holm, W. Charles Redding, Carl Allen Pitt
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Thomas L. Dahle

Discussion and Group Methods
Chairman: Laura Crowell
Vice-Chairman: John W. Keltner
Secretary: R. Victor Harnack
Advisory Committee: P. Merville Larson, N. Edd Miller, William S. Howell
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Martin P. Anderson

General Semantics and Related Methodologies
Chairman: Bess Sondel
Vice-Chairman: W. Arthur Cable
Secretary: William V. Haney
Advisory Committee: Kenneth Harwood, Dale D. Drum, Paul D. Bagwell
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Elton S. Carter

High School Discussion and Debate
Chairman: Ray G. Arveson
Vice-Chairman: Ivan L. Rehn
Secretary: Mary S. Ritter
Advisory Committee: George DeBell, Herbert Booth, Albert L. Swank
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Maurice E. Swanson

History of Speech Education
Chairman: Edyth M. Renshaw
Vice-Chairman: Donald K. Smith
Secretary: Marceline Erickson
Advisory Committee: Clarence W. Edney, Giles W. Gray, John T. Rickey
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Donald K. Smith

Interpretation
Chairman: Ray Irwin
Vice-Chairman: L. LaMont Okey
Secretary: Melvin R. White
Advisory Committee: Wilma H. Grimes, L. H. Mouat, Anthony J. Ostroff
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: L. LaMont Okey

Parliamentary Procedure
Chairman: Alice F. Sturgis
Vice-Chairman: Wayne E. Brockriede
Secretary: William S. Tacey
Advisory Committee: H. Barrett Davis, Yetta G. Mitchell, William S. Tacey
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Wayne E. Brockriede

Personal and Social Psychology of Speech
Chairman: Wayne N. Thompson
Vice-Chairman: John W. Black
Secretary: Dean C. Barnlund
Advisory Committee: Andrew T. Weaver, Clarence T. Simon, Donald G. Sikkink
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Ernest G. Bormann

Radio-Television-Film
Chairman: Edgar G. Willis
Vice-Chairman: Samuel L. Becker
Secretary: David R. Mackey
Advisory Committee: Robert Haakenson, D. Glenn Starlin, Leo A. Martin
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Bruce A. Linton

Rhetoric and Public Address
Chairman: Carroll C. Arnold
Vice-Chairman: Ernest J. Wrage
Secretary: Margaret L. Wood
Advisory Committee: Douglas Ehninger, Robert G. Gunderson, A. Craig Baird
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: W. Norwood Brigance

Speech and Hearing Disorders
Chairman: R. Corbin Pennington
Vice-Chairman: John Moncur
Secretary: Jane Dorsey Zimmerman
Advisory Committee: Mildred F. Berry, Severina E. Nelson, Letitia Raubichek
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Hilda Fisher

Speech for Religious Workers
Chairman: P. Merville Larson
Vice-Chairman: Lionel Crocker
Secretary: Paul D. Brandes

SPEECH FOR FOREIGN AND BILINGUAL STUDENTS
Chairman: Elizabeth Carr
Vice-Chairman: A. T. Cordray
Secretary: Jeanne E. Miles
Advisory Committee: Eva G. Currie, Rebecca E. Hayden, Claude L. Shaver
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: A. T. Cordray

SPEECH IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Chairman: Geraldine Garrison
Vice-Chairman: Dorothy G. Kester
Secretary: Jean C. Ervin
Advisory Committee: Julia C. Piquette, Elise Hahn, Mardel Ogilvie
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: James E. Popovich

SPEECH IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS
Chairman: Waldo Phelps
Vice-Chairman: Maybelle Conger
Secretary: Freda Kenner
Advisory Committee: Betty May Collins, Bea Olmstead, Yetta G. Mitchell
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Wanda B. Mitchell

UNDERGRADUATE SPEECH INSTRUCTION
Chairman: Henry L. Ewbank, Jr.
Vice-Chairman: Iline Fife
Secretary: Caroline L. Drummond
Advisory Committee: Alan W. Huckleberry, Thomas Sawyer, Dana M. Woodbridge
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Donald E. Hargis

VOICE, PHONETICS AND LINGUISTICS
Chairman: Johnnye Akin
Vice-Chairman: Hilda Fisher
Secretary: Eva G. Currie
Advisory Committee: Claude M. Wise, Eleanor M. Luse, C. K. Thomas
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Johnnye Akin

BUDGETS SUBMITTED BY FINANCE COMMITTEE AND APPROVED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AT THE 1956 CONVENTION

	Tentative Budget 1956-1957	Revised Budget 1956-1957	Proposed Budget 1957-1958
Publications:			
The Quarterly Journal of Speech	$10,200.00	$11,000.00	$11,000.00
Speech Monographs	4,000.00	5,700.00	4,500.00
The Speech Teacher	5,400.00	6,400.00	6,400.00
Directory	2,750.00	3,200.00	3,200.00
Special Printing	500.00	1,300.00	700.00
Repurchase of Old Copies	250.00	500.00	500.00
Printing and Mimeographing:			
Stationery	1,000.00	600.00	600.00
New Solicitations	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
Renewals	250.00	500.00	500.00
Placement	500.00	500.00	500.00
Convention	2,000.00	2,000.00	1,500.00
Personnel:			
Officers and Committees	1,500.00	2,000.00	2,500.00
Secretary and Clerical	15,000.00	16,200.00	16,500.00
Dues and Fees:			
American Council on Education	200.00	200.00	200.00
AETA Share of Convention Fee	500.00	750.00	250.00
Commissions and Discounts	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
Bank Charges	25.00	80.00	100.00
Secretary's Bond and Audit	300.00	350.00	350.00
Other Expenses:			
Postage and Distribution	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00
Binding	700.00	700.00	700.00
Telephone and Telegraph	300.00	300.00	300.00
Insurance	200.00	200.00	200.00
Convention Expense	1,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00
Depreciation	500.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
Provision for Doubtful Accounts	500.00	500.00	500.00
Office Supplies and Service	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
	$53,575.00	$61,980.00	$60,000.00
Replacement of Old and Purchase of New Equipment	500.00	1,000.00	500.00
Purchase of Carload of Paper			4,000.00
Reserve Fund for Permanent Headquarters			1,500.00

REPORT ON THE SAA PLACEMENT SERVICE

During the period from 1 September, 1955 to 1 September, 1956, over 440 vacancies were reported to the SAA Placement Service. During the previous year, 430 were reported. Openings were in private clinics, public schools, junior colleges, colleges and universities. The distribution was as follows:

Universities and colleges	335
High Schools	43
Graduate assistantships	23
Clinics	38

The college vacancies were distributed among the subject matter fields as follows:

Public Address	163
Radio and Television	34
Speech Correction	111
Interpretation	6
Voice and Phonetics	10
Theatre: Directors	38
Technical Theatre	40
Other Positions	4

Again this year the principal demand was in the fields of public address, speech correction, and theatre. Many employers are still seeking persons who are qualified to teach in two or more areas. Persons who wish to specialize have the best chance of finding positions in the areas of debate, radio and television, technical theatre, and speech correction.

Fifty per cent of the college offerings were at the level of instructor. However, a comparison of 1954-1955 with 1955-1956 shows that there was a significant tendency of the administrators to offer prospective teachers the rank of assistant professor.

The salaries offered in 1955-1956 were on the average approximately $500 higher than those offered in 1954-1955.

PRESENTATION OF THE INDEX TO QJS

At the annual convention luncheon of SAA in the Conrad Hilton Hotel, on December 28, 1956, Professor Giles Wilkeson Gray, of Louisiana State University, formally presented to the Association his *Index to The Quarterly Journal of Speech*. Dr. Waldo Braden, Executive Secretary, gratefully accepted the volume in the name of the Association. (The *Index* was reviewed in the February number of *QJS*). Here follows the text of Professor Gray's speech of presentation:

Mr. President, Dr. Braden, and Members and Friends of the Association:

When I started out more than twenty years ago, during the first year of Dr. Wise's editorship, to compile the annual *Indexes* to *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, if anyone had suggested that that yearly chore would be parlayed into an enterprise of the present dimensions, I am not at all sure that I would have undertaken it. But as I look back over those years, they have not seemed so long after all, and I can truly say that I have enjoyed them.

There really isn't a great deal to say about this project. It all began quite modestly, each successive annual *Index* being added to the others, until finally we found that we had a cumulative *Index* covering some forty years. Then about that time Dr. Braden set up shop nearby, found a publisher who was willing to make the venture with all this material, and so it was done.

An *Index*, if studied carefully, makes interesting reading, even though, like the dictionary, it does change subjects so often. "You'd be surprised, though," as the Stage Manager in *Our Town* says, "on the whole, things don't change much around here." And *you'd* be surprised, too, in looking through the *Index* to the *Journal*, to find that many of the things people are writing about today they were writing about thirty and forty years ago. And I am very much of the belief that if today we were to go back and rediscover the things our contributors were saying in those years when our Association and our *Journal* were young, we might even find that they were possessed

of a keen insight into the problems and principles of our field. Yes, there's a surprising amount of good reading in the *Index*. Look it up; things *don't* change a great deal in our profession, not fundamentally, anyway.

Even more important, though, is the fact that such an *Index* can direct you to some very fine reading both in the original contributions and in the book reviews that have appeared from the very beginning. One cannot but be impressed by the tremendous scope of thought that has been covered during the past forty years. Just to mention a few items: go back and read Woolbert's "The Teaching of Speech as an Academic Discipline" (which it hasn't always been), written in 1923, or his papers on conviction and persuasion, which appeared from 1917 to 1919; or read Everett Lee Hunt's "Plato on Rhetoric and Rhetoricians," published thirty-six years ago; or Bromley Smith's articles on the Greek Sophists, in the twenties; Hoyt Hudson's "The Tradition of our Subject" will give you an added glow of pride in our profession. You should know Andrew Weaver's "The Case for Speech"; James A. Winans' "The Need for Research," which appeared in the very first issue of the *Journal;* and James M. O'Neill's "Professional Maturity," in Volume XXVII. The people who were active in the early days of our Association were making contributions which will influence the thinking of the speech profession for many years to come. Unless one knows what they were saying, one doesn't know the literature of speech, any more than one can know the literature of rhetoric and never have read *De Oratore*.

You don't have to thumb through forty volumes of the *Journal* now to find who has contributed to its pages, or to learn what has been written on a given subject. This *Index* was compiled for the sole purpose of enabling you to locate quickly and with the least amount of random searching what you are looking for. And believe me, there is plenty to look for.

I mentioned that Dr. Braden had found someone who would undertake to bring this *Index* to you. I want to close with a comment about our publisher, William C. Brown. With respect to what he has done for all of us, I feel like the immigrant who had come over from the Old Sod and had got a job. This was back in the days when they didn't have elevators to carry building materials to the upper floors. Anyway, he wrote to his cousin back home about it. "Come on over, Paddy," he wrote. "I've got a fine job and I can get you one just like it. We're working on a big brick building and we're up to the sixth floor already. All I have to do all day is to carry the bricks up to the top floor, and there's a man there that does all the work." All I had to do was to get the bricks to Dubuque, Iowa, and there Mr. Brown and his company did all the work.

Dr. Braden, it is a pleasure and a privilege to present to the Speech Association of America this *Index* to the first forty volumes of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*.

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ROBERT GUNDERSON, *Editor*

UNFRIENDLY PERSUASION

Ross Scanlan

America is waking slowly—too slowly, some think—to the possibility that we are not adequately defending ourselves against international Communist propaganda operations. Certainly neither we, the people, nor our leaders seem to feel the need for vigorous countermeasures. This year President Eisenhower has gone to Congress for troops and money to match Soviet penetration in the Middle East, but nothing has been said about matching Soviet or other Communist propaganda activities in the area. Our country seems to place all its faith in its weapons and its national wealth. Out of these resources we look to match aggression of any kind anywhere in the world.

Here and there in America individual voices have been raised in warning. In April 1952, Dr. George Gallup, in a lecture entitled "Why We Are Doing So Badly in the Ideological War," said: ". . . Russia's conquest in Asia, her growing strength in the Middle East, and her strong minority position in other parts of the world have come about not by force of arms, but by force of propaganda. This is a type of warfare that our civil and military leaders obviously know little about. Our ignorance in this all-important field is staggering. . . . A conservative guess is that Russia is 15 to 20 years ahead of us in knowledge of propaganda and in skill in using it."

In 1953 Edward M. Barrett, who had been Assistant Secretary of State in charge of our international information and education activities from 1950 to 1952, published his experiences and observations in a book entitled *Truth Is Our Weapon*. Some of his observations are as pertinent today as they were then:

> . . . the mass opinions of large groups or of entire populations, abroad and at home, have far more impact on international developments than in years gone by. In country after country the views of ordinary citizens are altering major policies.
>
> Totalitarian tyrants are miles ahead of us in recognizing the growing force of mass opinion.
>
> A small group of men and women have battled for years to get the United States Government and particularly the Congress, to recognize the power of the word and to provide the funds, the manpower, and the consistent support needed.
>
> America's information-program budgets have gone up and down like a yo-yo. When Congress is frightened, personnel is hastily recruited, screened for loyalty and security, and laboriously trained. Then a lull descends, funds are cut, and much of the trained personnel returns to private industry.

Mr. Barrett repudiates the idea that we have a large and immediate reservoir of strength in our advertising business. "Simply transplanting the highly developed American techniques of ad-

Ross Scanlan (Ph.D., Cornell University, 1937) is Professor of Speech at the City College of the College of the City of New York. He is the author of a number of articles on Nazi propaganda organization and techniques.

vertising and public relations to foreign lands can produce gross blunders. What sells soap in Indiana can unsell democracy in India." As I recall, it was "soap" that Adolf Hitler used in his analogy but with a very different conclusion.

We can easily trace the contrast between American and totalitarian estimates of propaganda as far back as the end of World War I. Take the year 1920 as an example. In 1920 the leaders of the Kremlin established Agitprop, a top-level department of Agitation and Propaganda to supervise the construction and operation of an apparatus that was to number hundreds of thousands of workers in domestic and foreign propaganda. In 1920 an obscure Corporal Hitler had just won himself the position of Propaganda Director in a small and equally obscure political party which he was to build, through propaganda as much as anything else, into the enormously powerful National Socialist German Workers Party. In 1920 Americans, disillusioned by a wave of skepticism about war stories of German atrocities, decided that "propaganda" was a nasty business, essentially the art of telling inflammatory lies, and that the most that could be said for it was that it was the kind of thing that might happen in time of war, but now we had just won a war to end wars. The subsequent fact is that we have never fully revised these attitudes, except for the period of World War II; their weight lies on our policies and actions today as it has for almost four decades.

The result is further skepticism and uncertainty. Too many questions are unanswered for too many people. There seems to be no agreement among us as to how important, i.e., how effective, propaganda actually is, what the best techniques are, or why the enemy places so much value on it. It almost seems that the longer and the more vigorously the Communists make propaganda, the more convinced we become that we want no part of it. This sense of moral and intellectual superiority is all very well, provided propaganda is not as effective as the totalitarians clearly think it is, and that our reliance on weapons and wealth is adequate to meet the combined challenge of force and persuasion that the Communists are using.

As I have said, individual voices have been crying out against these assumptions for a long time. One might remember F. E. Lumley's *The Propaganda Menace*, published in 1933, or the brief life of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis at the end of that decade. Since the beginning of the cold war—one might say, since the beginning of a general recognition that such a thing as cold war exists—there has been a steady stream of books, relatively small though growing, that have, as their primary purpose, to wake us up and to acquaint us, in detail, with what the totalitarian forces are doing to benefit themselves through propaganda. But definitely there has been no conspicuous public response and no significant response in the small and belated measures taken by our government.

In the December issue of *QJS* Robert T. Oliver reviews five books, two of which are especially relevant to the present theme: *Worldwide Communist Propaganda Activities*, edited by F. Bowen Evans, and *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia: A Study in Mass Persuasion* by Alex Inkeles. These books give a specific and exhaustive account of Communist output and methods in propaganda for domestic consumption and for export. In particular, the book by Dr. Inkeles, Senior Fellow in the Russian Research Center at Harvard

University, ought to be required reading for all who want to know what Communism is doing about thought-control and mass influence behind the Iron Curtain. The book edited by F. Bowen Evans describes "the nature, volume and cost of the total Communist propaganda effort during 1954." The same scope, for the year 1955, is covered in *Target: The World,* edited by Evron M. Kirkpatrick.

Books like these are written with the avowed purpose of upsetting American attitudes of indifference and superiority to the challenge of enemy propaganda action. In his preface Dr. Kirkpatrick quotes Richard Aron's *The Century of Total War:* "The battle against propaganda and infiltration must be waged indefatigably." He then continues:

> We are only beginning to learn this lesson; but we must learn it—both fully and well. We dare not hide our heads in the clouds. . . . Thus, no matter how we feel about the use of the instruments of propaganda by the state, we are virtually forced to combat the weapon the enemy uses day after day to undermine our policies, alienate our friends, and mobilize hostility to our very existence.
>
> Because we are forced, even against our inclinations, into the propaganda battle, it is important that we develop a better understanding of propaganda and of the propaganda war being waged against us all over the world. . . . Propaganda is the effort to influence, by the use of communications, the attitudes of individuals and groups, and consequently to influence their actions. In this broad sense, propaganda is not in and of itself good or bad, true or false. It may and often does employ half-truths, distortion, and deception; but it may also employ truth or affective symbols that are neither true nor false. . . .

Target: The World covers Communist activities in the Far East, Latin America, Western Europe, and the area that comprises the Near East, South Asia, and Africa. It gives an "over-all picture of Communist strength, objectives, strategy, and tactics, and specific propaganda activities for each of these four major areas, followed by a more detailed treatment for each country in the area." The editor may very justly say: "To read these accounts is to be impressed with the importance that Communism attaches to its propaganda effort."

I doubt that the basic qualitative elements in persuasion have changed since Aristotle recorded them more than two thousand years ago. But technology, science, and politics have combined to give the art new dimensions. Under the impetus of Communist and Fascist strategy persuasion is more extensive and intensive. The new extent is shown in these descriptions of Communist propaganda apparatus. The new intensiveness is dramatically symbolized in the word "brain-washing." "Brain-washing" is the new persuasion seen in terms of specific individuals on whom it was practiced in its most concentrated form in prisons throughout Communist countries, culminating in such incredible events as the testimony of the defendants at the Moscow purge trials, the trial of Cardinal Mindzenty, and from the testimony of American prisoners of war in Korea.

Edward Hunter, a journalist with many years of experience in the Orient, has written two books dealing with brain-washing: *Brain-Washing in Red China* (1951) and *Brain-Washing: the Story of Men Who Defied It* (1956). For the more recent book he has interviewed a very large number of returned prisoners of war who were put through the process. As the subtitle indicates, the emphasis here is on the resistance these men were able to put up, but we can infer from this and other sources what the basic elements of the technique are:

1) The brain-washer must be able to administer a system of punishments and

rewards, though often threats and promises are enough.

2) The brain-washers must be in a position to isolate their victims, i.e. to cut off or at least to regulate completely all forms of communication reaching the victim from sources other than those of the brain-washers.

3) The brain-washer must cultivate by carefully planned means a state of the utmost confusion in the minds of the victims, shaking all sense of certainty they may possess; this is often done by blending endless relays of interrogation and talk with artificially induced states of protracted physical discomfort.

4) The brain-washer is an applied psychologist who acts on the premise that most individuals carry some personal sense of guilt in their psyche and that well-planned interrogation and forced "self-criticism" can expose such guilt feelings and make them transferable to the "confessions" the brain-washer desires.

5) Finally, apparently inspired by Pavlov's experiments with conditioned reflex actions, brain-washing subjects the victim to an incredibly protracted and intense barrage of slogans and persuasive appeals.

Hunter's is a newspaperman's account of brain-washing, told simply and in much of the language that the victims used when he interviewed them after release. Not as a competitor to this book but rather as a companion work with a more scientific background, we should recommend Joost A. M. Meerloo' *The Rape of the Mind: the Psychology of Thought Control, Menticide, and Brainwashing.* The author is a doctor of medicine and instructor in psychiatry at Columbia University. Escaping from a Nazi prison during the war, he became Chief of the Psychological Department of the Netherlands Forces, later High Commissioner of Welfare for the Netherlands, and still later, when he came to the United States, he was called as an expert witness in the case of Colonel Schwable, the Marine Corps officer who was brain-washed into a false confession of germ warfare.

Dr. Meerloo explains the connection with Pavlov and the basis of brain-washing in these words:

> What the Pavlovian council tries to achieve is the result of an oversimplification of psychology. Their political task is to condition and mold man's mind so that its comprehension is confined to a narrow totalitarian concept of the world. It is the idea that such limitation of thinking to Lenin-Marxist theoretical thinking must be possible for two reasons: first, if one repeats often enough its simplification, and second, if one withholds any other form of interpretation of reality.

Dr. Meerloo believes that, in substance, the technique of brain-washing can be applied to masses of people, to whole nations, and indeed is being applied in totalitarian countries today. More than that, he believes that some danger of individual and mass brain-washing exists in nearly every society. "Only blind wishful thinking can permit us to believe that our own society is free from the insidious influences mentioned in Part One, 'The Techniques of Individual Submission.'"

> There actually exists such a thing as a technique of mass brain-washing. This technique can take root in a country if an inquisitor is strong and shrewd enough. He can make most of us his victims albeit temporarily.

One interesting point which both Mr. Hunter and Dr. Meerloo accept and stress is the generally very temporary nature of these forced conversions. Once the brain-washer loses or relaxes his hold on the environment of the victims, especially on communications reaching the victims from sources at odds with the

brain-washer, the whole structure of artificially induced belief soon breaks down in most cases. Mr. Hunter's book brings out that communication among themselves, between "sessions," was the POWs' best means of resistance; and the brain-washers, knowing that, often put their most promising rather than their stubbornest victims in solitary confinement. There is an obvious but highly important lesson for democracy in the apparent fact that these hothouse beliefs cannot survive in the windy climate of opposition and debate.

Reading *Target: The World* and these books on brain-washing, one cannot avoid the feelings that come to a person when he sees himself confronted by open enmity, by planned and ruthless hostility. This is not the sort of hostility we usually find in fiction. It is altogether too real, too coldly impersonal. In the mind of the brain-washer himself it is the hostility of system against system in which the individual on either side counts for relatively little.

The political and social implications of hostility have occurred to psychologists. Dr. Leon J. Saul, Professor of Clinical Psychiatry at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, in a recent book, *The Hostile Mind*, says: "Demagogues rise to power chiefly by organizing and manipulating the latent hostility in the body politic. Hence they so often begin with little lies, twists of truth, and other corruptions of morality and ethics, the dikes against the ever-present sea of hostility. . . ."

> One can attack the devil, "hostility," just as one attacks any other disease by bringing modern science to bear upon it and then making use of the knowledge gained. . . .
>
> In the long run, our security will not rest with atom bombs but with a population which is strong, realistic and resourceful, through its achievement of emotional maturity.
>
> The greatest single effort of the nation and of the world should be devoted to seeing that its children mature emotionally from the moment of conception. This is the basic answer to man's tendency to torture and destroy himself. The practical difficulties can be overcome.

In view of phrases like "in the long run," "should be devoted," "can be overcome," the hardheaded among us may see no useful connection between this and the immediate challenges of totalitarianism. If democracy means anything, it means the existence of free and responsible opposition on even the most vital issues, and this calls for a high degree of emotional and intellectual maturity. Most concisely, it means the right of debate. Nor can we insist that the maturity come first—if we do, we probably mean conformity rather than maturity—for debate is an essential means to maturity.

Confronted today with the challenge of totalitarian propaganda, this country has three roads open to it. We may continue our indifference to the propaganda challenge and put all our faith in bombs and the wealth of our economy. Unfortunately bombs may destroy us. Unfortunately the wealthiest economy is subject to strains and limitations. Unfortunately there are totalitarians on the extreme Right as there are on the extreme Left.

Or we may set out to match the Communists slogan for slogan and simplification for simplification. Unfortunately, as Mr. Barrett has said, this may *unsell* democracy in India, and it could end up by unselling it here. This was clearly the route that Hitler took in his war against Communism. In *Mein Kampf* he warned his followers and future party workers that effective counter-propaganda must have no truck with standards of morality, objectivity, or taste. But, of course, he could do that because what he proposed for his own people was a program of mass brain-

washing equal to anything the Communists had planned. Unfortunately there seems to be no way to promote standards of maturity by methods that violate them.

The third road, admittedly not without its pitfalls and as yet unlighted areas, lies not in imitating the strategy of totalitarians but in affirming, by action rather than platitudes, those very qualities that make our system different: free thought; free speech; and the right of open opposition. This should be combined with a widespread program, through our educational institutions and our media of mass communication, that exposes the thought-smothering techniques of Communist persuasion. Aristotle is still right: a knowledge of the tricks of persuasion is still the best defense against them.

The third road? Debate the *content* of any propaganda; expose its *method*. This road may involve "propaganda" but certainly not in imitation of totalitarian propaganda with its obvious contempt for public knowledge and public intelligence.

BOOKS REVIEWED

TARGET: THE WORLD COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN 1955. Edited by Evron M. Kirkpatrick. New York: Macmillan, 1956; pp. xxiv+362. $5.00.

BRAINWASHING: THE STORY OF MEN WHO DEFIED IT. By Edward Hunter. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1956; pp. 310. $3.75.

THE RAPE OF THE MIND: THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THOUGHT CONTROL, MENTICIDE, AND BRAINWASHING. By Joost A. M. Meerloo, M.D. Cleveland and New York: World Publishing, 1956; pp. 320. $5.00.

THE HOSTILE MIND: THE SOURCES AND CONSEQUENCES OF RAGE AND HATE. By Leon J. Saul, M.D. New York: Random House, 1956; pp. 211. $3.50.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON AMERICAN EDUCATION. By Robert M. Hutchins. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1956; pp. xiii+112. $2.75.

CONSTRAINT AND VARIETY IN AMERICAN EDUCATION. By David Riesman. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1956; pp. 160. $2.75.

Here are two highly significant commentaries on American education; both are from the University of Chicago, and illustrate the diversity of views which may be expected to issue from that campus.

Robert Hutchins is lecturing to English universities, and he must have given his hearers many opportunities to thank God that they did not live in America. His account of American education will probably receive the same hearty welcome that was given *Babbitt* by English and European readers in the twenties. Although the *Saturday Review* in a recent spate of articles on business and education in America has announced that the wars between Babbitt and the eggheads now are ended, and offers impressive documentary support of his thesis, Mr. Hutchins' book is something of a history of Babbitt domination. It should be said, however, that he stands as a foursquare American democrat in favor of education for all, and believes that the world must follow us in this, but that it may well learn from our mistakes. He warns against regarding our universities as merely places of accommodation, where young people may spend the time as pleasantly as at resort hotels; he thinks we are often narrowly and foolishly vocational; and he restates his credo that education should teach us how to live by learning to understand the great philosophers, historians, scientists, and artists. In the thought of these great figures we can come to rest with ideas applicable to all times and all places. Mr. Hutchins seems to me to be an apostle of the eternal values, and he has something of a medieval *De Contemptu Mundi* when it comes to the ephemeral excitements of today's educational experimentation, which seems to go faster and faster as it loses its way. His humanities are fixed, and no pseudo-sciences (including communication) need apply. But in spite of his continuing joy in his malicious witticisms, the tone of an earlier volume, *No Friendly Voice*, is considerably changed, and he is now an apostle of hope.

David Riesman's *Constraint and Variety in American Education* seems somewhat more subtle, as having less of a fixed philosophy. He

is an interested observer of the ebb and flow of education, and likes to calculate the strength of opposing movements and predict the probable direction of new currents. We suffer continually, he says, from the "stalemate of success"; curricular changes, for instance, achieve their objectives, but we are not soon enough aware of the new problems that have been raised. An intense awareness is itself a value; the exaltation and hope of change and experiment is what we should never lose. To one of Mr. Hutchins' temperament ceaseless change brings the feeling that "all things are full of weariness, all the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; unto the place whither the rivers go, thither they go again." To Mr. Riesman cyclical changes bring endless delight; our task is to see that the cycles are not arrested, and our activity is to see what countercycles are needed and to initiate them. His analogy is that of Keynesian economics, to spend public money in times of depression, and to institute savings in periods of inflation. This is made all the more difficult by the fact that the American procession of colleges moves at different speeds. His analogy is that of the snake, with the head darting speedily, the middle moving tardily, and the tail in relative torpor. His figure reminds me of the tip some Texas cowboys gave me last summer when they warned me to carry a gun to shoot the snakes when camping in New Mexico. "But I am not much of a shot. I probably can't hit them," I said. "You don't have to be a shot," they said. "The rattlesnakes strike at the bullet as it goes by, and they never miss." Our foundations have added to the speed of the strikes by the colleges at the head of the procession, but by the time the colleges at the tail are ready to move, the head colleges are suffering again from the stalemate of success.

The major innovation which interests Mr. Riesman is the inclusion of interdepartmental courses, with special reference to the contributions that sociology, psychology, and anthropology can make to such thoroughly departmentalized fields as history, economics, and political science. These departments often assert home guard veto powers to maintain their vested interests in the curriculum. But even such reforms as Mr. Riesman advocates, if adopted, would not lead to fixed educational policy. They in their turn will lead to other cycles. For the present, students seem to be greatly interested in exploring themselves in a college setting. They have recently lost interest in economics and political science (perhaps temporarily) and are more interested in the light thrown on themselves by interdepartmental courses in culture and personality, and by institutes of human relations, which still have a large element of cross-fertilization, and which, perhaps, should be called the new humanities.

Mr. Riesman, too, is hopeful, in spite of all his digs; his one foe is stagnation. His book is not to be adequately represented by a summary review. It is full of subtle and striking observations, and in both style and content it has those characteristics which have made him a "best-selling sociologist." Teachers of speech may read with particular sympathy his account of the veto groups, and may see new possibilities in cross-departmentalization.

As a small-town man, graduating from a small college that Mr. Riesman would put well toward the tail of the snake, I have been especially interested in his contrast between those teachers who identify themselves with their institutions and even their communities, becoming the home guard, and those mobile (rootless?) cosmopolitans whose attachment is to their fields and to themselves, and who are a bubbling ferment in their attempts to fight rival interests, and land at the top, wherever that may be. Both types are necessary in any institution, of course. Riesman's account is very realistic, but a little depressing. It reminds me of Woodrow Wilson's remark that national politics was pretty simple after what he had been through at Princeton.

EVERETT LEE HUNT
Swarthmore College

RACINE AND ENGLISH CLASSICISM. By Katherine E. Wheatley. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1956; pp. x+345. $6.00.

Miss Wheatley has made the first detailed study of the English adaptations and translations of Racine during the neoclassical period. Her book bears its title, not because it treats the influence of Racine upon English classicism, but because the author assigns part of the blame for the translators' failure to neoclassic theory. Miss Wheatley's choice of subject seems to be an outgrowth of a particular kind of scholarship, prevalent in American graduate schools until very recently, which consists of the discovery and exhaustive treatment of some minor aspect of an important writer. Often this has been the "critical reaction": a sifting and summarizing of critics' opinions of a given author in a given period. Just as often we are presented with a survey of translations, of Goethe, of Shakespeare, of

Dante, none of which bring us much closer to an understanding of the poet himself, the nature of whose genius continues to elude us.

In the author's favor it must be said that she has done a most competent job in her restricted field. In each case she has made careful comparisons of the translations and their originals, taking care to discriminate between the various versions, and she has proved that to a man the translators were traitors. But despite this competency, or perhaps because of it, a certain repetitiousness creeps in. In each of the ten chapters she devotes to the translations, the concluding paragraph of adverse criticism is so similar that one wonders if her point, which most Racinians would have conceded before opening the book, could not have been made in briefer space. In our opinion, she adds unnecessarily to the book's length by including full summaries of three Racine plays, and partial summaries of two others. Plot summaries may have been necessary for the English versions, but certainly the author could have assumed her readers knew Racine.

There are two main problems involved in any study of translation of novel or drama. The first is, how close did the translator come to rendering the style of his model? The second is, how closely did he follow his model as regards character, action, or plot? Miss Wheatley considers both problems, but not systematically. For example, she devotes most of her discussion of an adaptation of *Iphigénie* to the translator's cavalier way with various stylistic devices peculiar to Racine. When she turns to Edmund Smith's *Phaedra*, she concentrates on structural changes, and in her chapter on Philips' *The Distrest Mother* (*Andromaque*), she discusses both elements.

A basic question related to the first problem mentioned above is whether any translator could reproduce Racine's poetic quality. Most critics today would agree that only a poet of the first rank could even approach it. Now it is obvious that the translators Miss Wheatley discusses are hacks or poetasters; to all of them might be applied the comment of an anonymous critic she quotes: their poetry is "stark naught." Yet she seems to have hoped to the end. In Chapter 10 she tells of her disappointment at the unfulfilled promise of one translator, a certain Boothby. "What was my surprise," she writes, "to find that Boothby had made many excisions, that much of his dialogue wasn't translation at all, but rather loose paraphrase." Experience should, one feels, have led her to expect that the worthy Boothby *would* have botched the job. Her knowledge of her subject should have led her to state resolutely that Racine never found a translator worthy of him and that to lose Racine's poetry is to lose all. She skirts this point when, discussing Dryden, she comments on the close resemblances between some lines from his *All For Love* and *Bérénice*. Racine's lines: "Depuis cinq ans entiers, chaque jour je la vois,/Et crois toujours la voir pour la première fois," become, in Dryden's hands, "I saw you every day, and all the day,/And every day was still but as the first," which renders the spirit of the French remarkably well, and seems to prove that Racine would have fared much better had he been Englished by a true poet.

But Miss Wheatley seeks her chief explanation for the translators' failure elsewhere: in neoclassic theory as it developed through Thomas Rymer and others, whose conception of tragedy as heroic melodrama with moralistic overtones the psychological subtlety of a Racine could not fit. She does not show, however, to what extent the translators themselves were versed in these theories, or whether, in effect, their heroics, bombast, and ornamentation—for example their use of Senecan devices—were not inherited from the worst traditions of the Elizabethan stage. Miss Wheatley rejects Dorothea Canfield's view that the English national genius was (and is) ill-attuned to Racinian tragedy, but adds the suggestion that the translators could not grasp the psychological subtlety and the dramatic value of Racinian "simplicity." My own feeling is that very likely the translators, almost all of whom were working for the stage, rejected certain elements and added others because they believed they knew what would appeal to an English audience. Such *a priori* conclusions are of course ill-founded, but this has never daunted adaptors. Just as the real Racine was unknown to the English eighteenth-century stage, so a Maurice Valency or a Lillian Hellman sees to it that American audiences will not see the real Giraudoux or the real Anouilh.

We suggested earlier that the type of research from which this study springs contributed little to our understanding of the artist, who is indirectly involved at best. It is obvious that Miss Wheatley agrees, in part at least, since she has not been satisfied with merely discussing the various translations, but has attempted to prove why they were failures. She goes even further; her labors of comparison, she tells us, "threw into relief the art of Racine and illumined it as no other approach had." It is perhaps a pity that Miss Wheatley

had to arrive in such a roundabout way at the realization that close examination of the text is the most rewarding approach to Racine. It is an experience that the translator almost always has, and it is one of the chief justifications for translation as a part of the learning process. And Miss Wheatley's work at times came very close to that of the translator himself. She knows her Racine very well, and therefore the incidental remark stemming from this or that comparison of translation and original is frequently incisive and shrewd. But frequently too these comments are disappointing, perhaps because the nature of the work prevented her expanding them. Thus we are interested when she states that the style of *Britannicus* "differs markedly" from the other six secular tragedies, but this peters out in a statement that Racine uses stychomythia "freely" in the word-duel between Nero and Britannicus, or in the really puzzling remark that "the style is often epigrammatic and therefore undramatic since it smacks of reflection." On occasion she shows an odd, critical timidity, as when she declares with a straight face, "Racinophile that I am, I prefer Racine's tragedy (*Bérénice*) to Otway's (*Titus and Bérénice*)." Need such a preference be justified, and especially as a mere matter of taste? When she says of Philips' *Distrest Mother*, "Occasionally some of the essence of Racine is lost," either she is misusing the term *essence* or making one of the most striking understatements in Racinian criticism.

Critics have attempted to explain Anglo-Saxon antipathy or apathy for Racine in various ways: the vigor of the Shakespearean tradition, the rarefied and subtle quality of Racine's poetry, English lack of psychological curiosity. Miss Wheatley adds the interesting suggestion that the translations she discusses helped to bias the Romantics against Racine. She suggests that Hazlitt, who thought Racine merely an elegant didactic, had read him only in English (although his incorrectly quoting a line in French is not proof of cursory reading, as Miss Wheatley suggests, but merely of bad memory). And as the present reviewer has pointed out elsewhere, Leigh Hunt denounced Racine after seeing Philips' *Distrest Mother*.

The present study will probably not do anything to bring Racine closer to Anglo-Saxon readers and playgoers. There is, however, room for more critical studies in English, following the lead of Strachey, Turnell, Brereton, and Sir Maurice Bowra. These we shall await with anticipation.

JOHN C. LAPP
University of California, Los Angeles

NATURE IN SHAKESPEARIAN TRAGEDY. By Robert Speaight. New York: Macmillan, 1955; pp. viii+179. $3.00.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE NATURAL CONDITION. By Geoffrey Bush. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956; pp. 135. $3.00.

Nature in Shakespearian Tragedy, informed by a working knowledge of the theater and by the main currents of recent criticism, is based on lectures and papers dating from March 1950 to April 1953. Considerably revised and extended, Robert Speaight's appraisal of five tragedies and a comedy is devoted chiefly to probing "the 'mystery of things' which only the restored sanity of Lear could elucidate." The book, according to its author, "does not pretend to be a work of scholarship; it is merely the reflexion of half a century spent in the company of Shakespeare." Nonetheless, Speaight's "idea of *nature*" encloses "a Shakespearian universe built upon three planes: . . . political, personal and elemental."

The opening chapter, "*Hamlet*," a dazzling prelude to all that follows, moves from considerations of rhetoric ("Hitherto the language of the scene has been smooth and slightly rhetorical; these were the accents of officialdom. . . . The language of the soliloquy is racy, terse and loquitive") to the periphery of psychoanalytic poetics—without quite going over the edge ("I owe to M. Jean-Louis Barrault the interesting suggestion that Gertrude had never enjoyed erotic satisfaction with Hamlet's father"), thence to the exigencies of contemporary staging ("I think it almost certain that Hamlet, as he enters through one of the side doors, sees the King and Polonius disappear through the curtains of the Inner Recess"), and ultimately to forthright critical evaluation ("*Hamlet* is not, I think, the greatest of Shakespeare's plays; not the most poetic, nor the most artistically achieved. But for modern men it is the most essential and the most exciting"). This section then concludes with a glance forward, in keeping with the book's *nature* design: "The crimes of Macbeth and the caprices of Lear will be born of [Hamlet's] defects and intellectual disorders. And it will require the almost superhuman will-power and the almost supernatural intelligence of Prospero to restore to man both his reason and his *raison d'être*."

Succeeding pages explore provocatively the "plane of society," especially "the jungle of Jacobean man," as Speaight conceives it: "Edmund's ancestry, . . . heralding a twentieth

century that Bradley never dreamed of, can be traced, clearly enough, through Iago and Antony, Henry V and Falstaff, to Falconbridge and Richard Crookback." His final chapter, "*The Tempest*," draws together many strands of previous inquiry and reassembles some of the fragments, but without the hazarding of easy, confident solutions. Summing up, he claims: Almost every heresy which has ravaged the modern world, and in particular those fathered by the sentimental genius of Rousseau, were pulverized in *The Tempest* centuries before they were born." Creditably, on the whole, Robert Speaight (in accordance with his own encomium to Shakespeare) "had the grace of genius not to rob us of our questions. He only made them clearer."

Shakespeare and the Natural Condition is an informal scholarly exercise with foundations in Renaissance metaphysics. Though the publisher advertises it as "impressionistic," Geoffrey Bush develops his book's nature scheme out of a fully coherent, firmly ordered matrix. In an introductory chapter, he contrasts representatives of "the modern view of experience as divided and fragmentary" against advocates of the divine order of Christian humanism. "Bacon and Webster," the author maintains, "are committed to their different conclusions, and Spenser and Chapman to another certainty; it is Shakespeare's natural and easy art that seems, in modern terms, to be 'unengaged.'" Through a judicious mingling of old-fashioned and newfangled notions about the plays, always against the solid background of Renaissance philosophy, Shakespeare emerges into new perspective.

The *natural condition* thesis ("I should like to consider what it means to Shakespeare's characters to belong to nature") lends itself ideally to the materials of Bush's discussion. Concerning "Comedy and the Perfect Image" he asserts: "In the histories and comedies the two aspects of the natural condition are the fact of natural incompleteness and the dream of natural order; the vision moves toward the moment of marriage or victory when fact is transformed and the dream is realized." And of "Tragic Character" he writes: "In tragedy we are made to see the fatal collision between the fact and the idea, and we witness the effort of human character to reach a settlement, without aid, between these two aspects of the natural situation." Here is no mere springboard for the launching of private speculations; Bush's arguments, given careful reading (in the light of the first chapter) seem generally sound, frequently stimulating.

Though one welcomes the author's observation that "in *Antony and Cleopatra* the visions of comedy and tragedy merge," however, the accompanying attribution to this work of "allegory and a single reality" is so vaguely delineated as to remain in doubt. There is, surely, too random and extended a cataloging of the "nature" references in *Macbeth;* whereas the claim that "*Hamlet* and *King Lear,* no doubt, are Shakespeare's greatest plays; they are, at any rate, the plays in which nature is mentioned most often" is *non causa pro causa* pleading. And Bush's evaluation of Cordelia as "revenger" also seems debatable.

The assets of this book more than offset its infelicities. Bush's suggestion that "the problem plays are divided between folktale and Christian symbol, between success and failure, and between comedy and tragedy" is illuminating. The bridges linking comedy and tragedy have seldom been more keenly perceived. The vigorous scholasticism is nicely balanced against Geoffrey Bush's own imaginative powers—a combination which readers should heartily endorse.

PAT M. RYAN, JR.
Colorado School of Mines

THE SPIRIT OF TRAGEDY. By Herbert J. Muller. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956; pp. xiv+335. $5.00.

Here is a book which raises many searching questions and offers a gratifying number of sensible and (to this reviewer) convincing answers. The book is not primarily concerned with defining the literary form known as tragedy or in tracing its development in the various periods of literature: it does these things as a means to an end, the end being to define the spirit of tragedy—or the tragic sense of life—as it appears in various historical periods, and to explain its function and its importance in human society. In the fulfillment of these broad aims, Professor Muller examines the remote origins of tragedy in the prehistoric Greek ritual of the Year-Daemon and analyzes the flowering of Greek tragedy in the era of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. He then considers three subsequent periods—the only three in which it can be claimed that tragedy has been written: the Elizabethan, the Neoclassical, and the Modern. In each period, Professor Muller analyzes only the leading dramatists. Throughout the analysis he writes in a style which is admirably clear and easy to read. His prose is always lucid, fluent, and pungent—often enlived by wit and never encumbered by critical jargon.

At the end of his survey of the leading tragic dramatists, Professor Muller asks the challenging questions of why great tragedy, and with it the tragic sense of life, has appeared so rarely in the history of the world and why on these rare occasions it has appeared only in Western cultures. His answers to these questions, as well as some of his literary and philosophical conclusions, may be challenged by other scholars but they cannot be dismissed lightly because of Professor Muller's firm grasp of his subject, because of his fair and perceptive consideration of the evidence and of other points of view, and, above all, because of his sound common sense.

Professor Muller's conclusion concerning the function of the tragic spirit in life can give comfort to the confused and troubled citizen of today. For the tragic spirit, says Muller, which recognizes the irremediable evil in human destiny and yet faces it with courage and clear vision, can promote in human society "a saving irony . . . a spirit of compassion . . . and a spirit of reverence for the idealism that keeps seeking truth, goodness, and beauty." Such a spirit "is proof of the dignity of man, which remains a basic tenet of Western democracy."

GARFF B. WILSON
University of California, Berkeley

THE VICTORIAN THEATRE, A SURVEY. By George Rowell. London: Oxford University Press, 1956; pp. xiii+203. $5.75.

English theater and drama in the nineteenth century are frequently by-passed by critics, historians, and courses of study in dramatic literature. Reasons for this neglect are many, but several may be indicated. This period was generally dominated by the actor, the actor-manager, the stage manager, and by stage spectacle. For the most part, people of quality refrained from going to the playhouse. Serious scholars have been willing to set the drama aside because much of it was of little literary worth and to slight staging because it was overburdened with conventionalized scenery, stuffy costumes, and devoted to dazzling effects.

Students in theater find that this neglect carries several consequences of import. Two may be mentioned. Sources for the rise and development of theatrical realism have roots in nineteenth-century activities. Trends in staging and playwriting from this period are easily confused and, sometimes, lost. Generally, however, the trends are blurred by neglect of nineteenth-century English backgrounds. Another consequence of this neglect is that this period witnessed the expansion, elaboration, and sometimes the perfection of methods of staging, lighting, mechanization, etc. Many of these devices were inherited from the creative theater of the Italian Renaissance and the evolution is a point of interest. The nineteenth-century British theater is a theater of the producer, the designer, and the mechanist with the result that exciting spectacular effects in melodramas, extravaganzas, pantomimes, and productions of Shakespeare are significant to the scholar.

Mr. Rowell has attempted to correct this situation. He has presented a survey of theater and drama from 1792 (*The Road to Ruin*) to 1914 (World War I) in four brief but compact chapters along with nineteen interesting illustrations. He has extended the chronology of the Victorian period with justification. His plan to include society drama (1893-1914) will be of interest to scholars.

Significant is Mr. Rowell's view that theater and drama are inseparable, that production aspects are related to the success of playwrights, and that the audience often dictates the theater fare. "No other period in English theater history," he writes, "illustrates so clearly the fact that a play exists fully only in performance." So, Mr. Rowell goes about to formulate a clear picture of the theatrical conditions which nurtured the playwright and, consequently, he underscores the essential theatrical worth of many apparently worthless scripts.

The value of this study is that as a survey it gives cohesive emphasis to divergent, and often contradictory, trends in the prolific nineteenth-century theater.

From this survey it is evident, however, that several traditional views require evaluation. Henry Irving is given top billing with Charles Kean nominated as "stage-manager." Further investigation is required here to give fresh interpretation to Charles Kean. As a footnote (to score the point that Kean has been overlooked by many writers), Mr. Rowell's fine bibliography lists twenty-six references to Irving but only two to Charles Kean. Mme. Vestris and Charles Mathews have two and one respectively. In connection with the Vestris-Mathews activities, values require reassignment with regard to the development of the interior and/or enclosed scene. Robertson's famous doorknobs have dominated the picture for many years.

This survey (along with other competent studies in this century) also makes it evident that further inquiry should be made into procedures and methods of staging.

Illustrations in this survey are carefully annotated and are precisely arranged to create a pictorial sequence. Unfortunately, they are not brought into the textual discussion where their value would have been greatly increased.

JOHN H. MCDOWELL
The Ohio State University

THE USES OF DRAMA. By Philip A. Coggin. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1956; pp. 327. $5.00.

The author, headmaster of a coeducational grammar school in England, concerns himself with the educational uses of drama. His book is not so much a history of events as a history of ideas, concepts, and standards of value. Beginning with "The Schools of Hellas" and ending with "Schools of the Eighteenth Century," Coggin devotes the first seventeen chapters to presenting historical facts as an illumination of prevailing attitudes. The nature of the book as a "cultural" rather than a "factual" history is better suggested by such chapter titles as: "Plato," "Aristotle," "The Tradition of Bacon," and "The Influence of Descartes." Chapter 18 discusses seven aspects of Goethe's dramatic theory, and the remaining seven chapters relate this discussion to the modern scene.

Mr. Coggin's style is readily comprehensible. His organization is clear, but forced at times. His research is sound and useful. The conclusions which he draws from his research and the relationships he makes between concepts are questionable. Perhaps for these very reasons, the work is highly stimulating to the thoughtful and interested reader. A great deal of information is here gathered together in one convenient place for the first time. The collection of such items in other single sources has been limited, previously, to those which had a broader scope and read like telephone directories.

The uses of *The Uses of Drama* are several. For the general theater historian, it presents nothing new in the way of facts except for a few details of questionable value. Its concentration on one phase of the general history, however, may clarify a certain orientation towards the drama which has served to motivate a great many theatrical events of historic significance. The education-centered reader will value the integration and, if he is not an Englishman, the insight into the contemporary English scene. The student of interpretation will be interested in the history of his discipline, although not labeled as such, particularly in the first half of the book. Teachers of any of the speech arts will be stimulated in their thinking upon the relationship between the education in which they are involved professionally and the particular field of their specialization.

MARTIN T. COBIN
University of Illinois

A BAKER'S DOZEN: THIRTEEN UNUSUAL AMERICANS. By Russel B. Nye. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1956; pp. 300. $5.00.

Biographer Nye has exhumed from their obscure burial places among the footnotes of history a baker's dozen of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Americans, and has sketched the eventful career of each in a neat, pointed essay of approximately twenty pages. This is a motley crew which Nye has rounded up—rascals, heroes, adventurers, scapegoats, dreamers, rebels. Some of their names are vaguely familiar, like the names of old acquaintances long since left behind and now all but forgotten: Simon Girty—we seem to remember him—and Jacob Coxey, Nat Turner, Elijah Lovejoy, and John Humphrey Noyes, though we discover we can identify each with only a sentence or two. With a flush of self-congratulation we recognize Clement L. Vallandigham, that thorn in President Lincoln's flesh, and Mary Baker Eddy's fascinating friend, Phineas Quimby. But who, pray, were John Fries, Harman Blennerhassett, Edward Bonney, John Murrell, James Strang, John Ledyard? All these men, familiar and unfamiliar, are here apparently not because they were influential or memorable or unjustly neglected, but because they were interesting human beings. This is reason enough, and we applaud Mr. Nye for the statement with which he concludes his preface: "For having pursued them a little farther than usual into their shadowed historical corners, the author makes no apologies."

Absorbing narratives these, told with a sense of the dramatic, and well worth the telling. Most poignant, perhaps, is the tale of Harman Blennerhassett, the Innocent, beguiled from his island Eden in the Ohio River by the Tempter, Aaron Burr. Most stirring is the account of adventurer John Ledyard, who dreamed of exploring the cool, green forests and snow-capped mountains of the American Northwest, but who died of a tropical fever and was buried in Egyptian sands after an almost incredible concatenation of crushing frustrations and disappointments. Stirring too is the story of Elijah Lovejoy, abolitionism's first

martyr, who died attempting to prevent the destruction of his fourth printing press, when it would have been so much easier merely to have stopped writing about the evils of slavery.

Only one of Nye's thirteen subjects was a notable public speaker. Fries preached rebellion in Pennsylvania taverns, Strang and Quimby had some success on the lecture platform, and Coxey could deliver an energetic speech on occasion, but only Clement Vallandigham achieved notoriety primarily through his oratory. Still, this book is not without specific interest to the student of speech. Those familiar with Wendell Phillips' "Murder of Lovejoy" address will appreciate this closer acquaintance with the minister-editor whose heroism was extolled that night in Boston's Faneuil Hall. Group discussion enthusiasts may be surprised to learn that some of their techniques were employed a century ago by John Humphrey Noyes' Perfectionists, and that one of the factors in the continuing success of their utopian experiment at Oneida was the practice of holding regular "mutual criticism" sessions in which complaints were aired, conflicts resolved, and the "I-spirit" subordinated to the "We-spirit." And there may be those among us who will be stimulated to trace whatever lines of unconscious influence may exist between Phineas Quimby and Dale Carnegie or Norman Vincent Peale. The perversions and mutations of Quimby's concepts of "personal magnetism" and "mental suggestion" on their way to becoming super-salesmanship and powerfully positive thinking should constitute a provocative study.

All readers of *A Baker's Dozen*, regardless of their special interests, will have occasion to thank Russel Nye when, coming upon the name of one of these unusual Americans in a footnote or passing reference, they are able to reconstruct from memory a full-length portrait of someone who, despite the excellence of this book, is destined to remain indefinitely in a shadowed corner of history.

BARNET BASKERVILLE
University of Washington

THE BEGINNINGS OF UNITARIANISM IN AMERICA. By Conrad Wright. Boston: Starr King Press, distributed by Beacon Press, 1955; pp. 305. $4.00.

The subject of the Great Awakening has spurred scholars into providing us with a small shelf of studies, dealing in part with some of the characters involved in the movement and in part with a general accounting of the impact of that fervent crusade. But not until Conrad Wright's *The Beginnings of Unitarianism in America* has there appeared a full-scale appraisal of the revolt against eighteenth-century New England Calvinism and a close examination of those ideas evolving out of it. Originally launched as a doctoral dissertation under the direction of Professor Perry Miller of Harvard and completed with the aid of a research grant from the Carnegie Fund of the American Historical Association, this work is a notable contribution.

It could be said that after the Great Awakening had about spent its force in 1760, the New England ministry either fruitlessly marked time with Calvinism or sat waiting for the arrival of French liberalism. Professor Wright shows that from 1735 to 1805 there was also a steady parade of events and ideas not altogether unexciting.

This evolvement, described as Arminianism, the growth of which was stimulated by its opposition—sponsors of the Great Awakening—slowly, and against numerical odds, established a rational base for future Unitarianism in eastern Massachusetts. Although it drew inspiration from overseas, especially from John Locke, Arminianism turned out to be a rather indigenous American product. In brisk prose the author traces the topical development of this new liberalism from the initial displeasure of ministers at having their prestige shaken by untutored followers of George Whitefield, through discussions of the nature of conversion, the freedom of the will, the benevolence of God, until individual freedom of belief became a fixed tenet of the new standard-bearers. Against the accustomed picture of Jonathan Edwards in the role of Knight Templar scattering the infidel from before the citadel of orthodoxy, the focus of attention is refreshingly new.

Students of speech should be interested in the author's analysis of the close-woven arguments of Charles Chauncy, Jonathan Mayhew, and Jeremy Belknap, able, brilliant men whose pulpit leadership powered the new philosophy, and particularly in the author's description of how the "decision-making elite," as Wright describes Chauncy and his Harvard friends, built a unified and coherent religious concept. By establishing themselves in key positions in clubs and associations throughout the Boston area, they exerted a powerful leavening process in the dissemination of ideas.

This work is of value in that it helps provide a background for a better understanding of the growth of liberal thought in New Eng-

land and a new perspective of the roles played by men whose ability and genius have hitherto been left unnoticed. One might ask for a more explicit exposition of minor points—an expanded definition of "natural religion" for example—but otherwise it is clear, well-organized and effectively written.

KENNETH W. PAULI
Vanderbilt University

THE WILD JACKASSES: THE AMERICAN FARMER IN REVOLT. By Dale Kramer. New York: Hastings House, 1956; pp. x+260. $4.50.

The Wild Jackasses is a highly readable account of the wave of agrarian discontent that swept through the Midwest and into the South between 1870 and 1936. The author shows a pattern of revolt in the uprisings of the Grangers, the Greenbackers, the Populists, the Leaguers, and other groups by emphasizing the rising tides of their rebellions and by discussing the leaders who emerged to lead the farmer in his never-ending fight for survival against wealth and privilege. The portraits of Mary Ellen Lease, the leading woman orator of her day, Ignatius Donnelly, the Sage of Nininger, General "Jumping Jim" Weaver of Iowa, "Sockless" Jerry Simpson of Kansas, Tom Watson of Georgia, A. C. Townley of North Dakota, Milo Reno of Iowa, and others show vividly why the conservative newspapers supporting the old political parties described these radical leaders as "wild jackasses" of the prairie.

The book is a popularized discussion of a story that has long needed retelling. Mr. Kramer is an excellent storyteller, and he draws good portraits. His best are those of Ignatius Donnelly, A. C. Townley, and Milo Reno. Less clear are those of Mary Ellen Lease, Tom Watson, and Ben Tillman. Nevertheless, within the covers of one book, the author presents a host of agrarian rebels who, in speaking for the farmer or in telling him what he should demand, left their mark upon our society.

For the most part, the book is descriptive and deals with people; there is not much evaluation or interpretation. The work is not a detailed study of agrarian movements even though the revolts in North Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa receive considerable attention. But the underlying implications concern the agricultural problems that motivated similar revolts in most of the agrarian states, and the solutions proposed by the Populists, the Leaguers, and other organizations represent solutions they thought were best for their day. In time, as a result of the farmer agitation, which occasionally became quite violent, some of their demands were written into legislation, and others were considered when the government finally determined policies to aid the farmer.

The Wild Jackasses, an addition to the American Procession Series, should prove interesting to students of American public address because it suggests possibilities for rhetorical studies of some very vociferous and colorful American orators.

HOLLIS L. WHITE
Queens College

GREAT AMERICAN LIBERALS. Edited by Gabriel Richard Mason. Boston: Starr King Press, 1956; pp. vii+177. $3.95.

The threat of international communism from abroad and the concurrent growing security which pervades our domestic economy today have united to give birth to the philosophy of our time—moderation. This era of moderation has been interpreted by some as being one of conservatism, one of entrenchment to preserve what we already have in the way of economic and political freedoms. Few will question that this group is the most vocal in our contemporary American society. Congressional investigations and self-appointed investigators in many of our communities have been two of the forces which have led us into this period of suspecting as un-American those who do not conform to the new psuedo-conservatism about which Richard Hofstadter has so brilliantly written in his *Age Of Reform.* Those of us who might believe that this situation is unique in our times will be stripped of our naïveté by reading this new volume edited by Gabriel Mason, which makes it indelibly clear that most of the great liberals in the history of this nation have had to fight those who suspected the liberal of un-Americanism simply by virtue of his desire to alter the status quo.

Although referred to in the Preface by Mason as a "refresher in the history of liberalism in America," *Great American Liberals* is not that. It is a collection of essays on the lives and ideas of twelve liberals in our history. Chosen on the basis of their "cumulative contribution to our social, cultural and political history," the book includes essays on Tom Paine, Thomas Jefferson, Horace Mann, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Abraham Lincoln, Henry Thoreau, Walt Whitman, Susan B. Anthony, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Woodrow Wilson, John Dewey, and Franklin Roosevelt. The distribution of political, social,

and educational reformists is admirable, but there is no attempt to trace the great liberal movements in our history, or to place them in perspective, one related to another. Indeed, there is no attempt at relating the individuals, even though many of them were contemporaries who were closely associated, being stimulated one by the other.

One of the basic problems to be faced in editing a book with this title is to define that ambiguity—liberalism. The editor chose to define it negatively, as meaning "a movement *away* from tyranny, be that tyranny political, social, or economic," and positively, as a "steady movement *toward* the realization of the noble ideals so clearly set forth in our Declaration of Independence by our Founding Fathers." This definition is about as helpful as the one supplied by the person who said, "A liberal is anyone who disagrees with me." Mason's definition does serve the purpose, however, of eliminating both the extreme left and the extreme right from consideration in this volume. Isadore Starr, writing on Susan B. Anthony, is more specific when he describes a liberal as one who is "critical of what is" and "always searching, thinking and fighting for *what ought to be*." By definition, then, a liberal is always in the minority, and must suffer the torment inflicted upon nonconformists.

With so many different contributors, one for each of the greats included between the covers, styles might be expected to vary, and they do. Some are better written than others, but all are measurably sympathetic toward their subjects. Sometimes the reader is aware of inconsistencies. For example, one author is quite proud of the fact that his subject is not a fanatic, implying that fanaticism is distasteful, while other authors are not at all ashamed of fanaticism. A unifying theme, however, pervades all of the essays: those who have liberal ideas become great only to the extent that they affect society. A liberal, thus, is not just an idealist, but a man of action.

Although many readers might puzzle over the absence of some of America's liberals, none will deny that those selected belong in such a volume. The essays are simple and moving in style, and they testify to the fact that it is only through nonconformity on the part of a few valiant people that a free nation can progress.

ROBERT C. JEFFREY
University of Virginia

OLD BULLION BENTON: SENATOR FROM THE NEW WEST. By William Nisbet Chambers. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1956; pp. xv+517. $6.00.

For forty years Thomas Hart Benton loomed large in the nation's affairs. As senator from Missouri for five terms, he fought near the center of the arena in every national controversy between 1820 and 1850. His contemporaries saw him as the equal of his adversaries Clay, Calhoun, and Webster, and in his own party Andrew Jackson alone commanded wider fame. Tom Sawyer, disappointed when he discovered that Senator Benton, "the greatest man in the world," was not twenty-five feet tall, differed from his elders in imagination more than in judgment.

Even had he not been a statesman of the first order, Benton's exciting life, colorful personality, and stern sense of public duty might well have made him one of posterity's favorites. Actually, he is little known. Schoolboys look blank at mention of his name, and biographers have ignored him for fifty years. The general acceptance of Jackson as the symbol of the democratic faith to which Benton adhered may be partially responsible for this eclipse, and the burning of his private papers shortly before his death may have discouraged prospective biographers.

William Nisbet Chambers, handsomely remedying all past neglect, has coped expertly with every difficulty in *Old Bullion Benton: Senator from the New West*, which reveals superbly what can be accomplished by the happy conjunction of literary talent and a trained historian's technical skill. With its forty pages of notes and seventeen-page bibliography, the fruit of ten years of research in scores of libraries and archival collections, this is a book for the most exacting scholar. With its admirable organization and attractive style it is also a book for the general reader.

Benton, pre-eminently an *advocate*, "the proposer of great measures, the crowd-compeller," formulated his policies by the application of general principles to particular situations, and then depended on speeches to get "public opinion to come up with him." Chambers never forgets that his subject achieved leadership and influence through persuasion, and shows himself to be a perceptive critic of Bentonian rhetoric. Illustration must be limited to one example. In 1849 the Old Roman stumped his state for six months in opposition to the Missouri Assembly's Jackson Resolution, which "instructed" him to support Calhoun's notion that

Congress had no power to legislate concerning slavery in the Territories. His campaign reached a climax at Fayette, in one of Missouri's chief slaveholding counties. Chambers sets the scene, summarizes the speech, and concludes:

> The Fayette speech . . . was Benton at his best—courageous, self-possessed, effective; despite its repetitions, filled with close, reasoned, specific analysis of issues and the Calhoun-Jackson Resolution doctrines; little given to the domineering and dealing in extraneous personalities that had begun to characterize Benton; bold and forthright, and yet linked to the predispositions of his larger public; exhaustive, historical, and factual, and yet simple and dramatic. In short, it was one of the major propaganda efforts of his life.

This is not a felicitous specimen of Chambers' normal style, but it is a sound characterization of a great speech.

"The lives of useful and eminent men should be written, not for the dead, but for the living. They should display not a vain panegyric, but a detail of circumstance which would lead the living to the same line of conduct with the same honorable result." The words are those of Thomas Hart Benton. His life has now been written in conformity with his prescription. If he achieves his proper place in the American Pantheon, this book will be chiefly responsible.

NORMAN W. MATTIS
University of North Carolina

WOODROW WILSON AND THE POLITICS OF MORALITY. By John Morton Blum. The Library of American Biography. Edited by Oscar Handlin. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1956; pp. vi+215. $3.50.

This short biography of Wilson, which made its appearance during the centennial year of his birth, treats admirably the main occurrences in the former President's life. The common property of all Wilson biographers is here presented by an author with an unusual talent for dramatization. He makes use of colorful anecdotes, vivid metaphors, and pointed similes. Within his dramatic interpretation, Blum has pictured Wilson, the man, objectively and in historical perspective. The story of Wilson flows along chronologically, and very many facts are compressed into very few pages. Yet, only here and there does complex sentence structure impede the reader. To compression also must be attributed the bold strokes which produce at times an impression of oversimplification.

The appropriate focus in this biography is upon Wilson's morality and idealism. After some exposition of their roots, Blum shows the operation of Wilson's moral insights as they prompted his decisions and actions. The handling of Wilson's moral convictions is the unique feature of this book. While other biographers consider the impact of Wilson's idealism and morality, none has made it the leading theme of his work. Blum considers Wilson's moral attributes as a boy and young man in his first chapter, as President of Princeton University in his second, as Governor of New Jersey in his third, and as President of the United States dealing with domestic and foreign policies in the remaining six. Occasionally, in the extended reports of national and international events contained in the later chapters, Wilson's concept of himself as a special instrument of moral force is obscured temporarily but always it reappears to sustain the underlying theme.

While Blum's main concern is with the role of morality in Wilson's political life, he also gives marked attention to the role of persuasion. He includes in his book accounts of Wilson's oratorical training and some of Wilson's pronouncements upon speechmaking. Blum views persuasion sometimes broadly, as the management of public opinion, sometimes narrowly, concentrating upon Wilson's speech powers or upon the single speech event. He emphasizes the role of persuasion more strongly as he recounts Wilson's early life than as he tells of his activities as President.

Blum's biography is not annotated, but there is a note on sources, which except for private papers are largely standard works on Wilson. The biography is noteworthy for its balance, accuracy, and completeness. These qualities make it good reading for those who wish better to acquaint themselves with Woodrow Wilson and for those who are seeking a framework of his life and times. Because of its emphasis on persuasion, this book is of special interest to students of speech.

JOHN F. WILSON
Cornell University

T. S. ELIOT'S POETRY AND PLAYS: A STUDY IN SOURCES AND MEANING. By Grover Smith, Jr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956; pp. xii+338. $6.00.

The publishers describe this as "the most comprehensive study of the sources and mean-

ings of T. S. Eliot's poetry . . . that has yet been attempted." Undoubtedly they are accurate in their description. Professor Smith (assistant professor of English at Duke University) has demonstrated with considerable care and in great detail the synthesizing process by which Eliot normally creates, borrowing an idea here and a motif there and echoing and reverberating with thoughts from around the globe. The arrangement of the study is on the whole chronological; the book's helpfulness to the general reader of Eliot will be great. The analyses of individual poems are always sensible and compact. Professor Smith's admiration for Eliot's achievement is constantly tempered by a sharp and insistent sense of his limitations as a poet. For this reader, at least, Professor Smith's concluding judgments are supported by the evidence which he has so carefully gathered. Two of his statements in particular are worth quoting:

> Apart from poetry by W. B. Yeats, that of Eliot may include the greatest written in the contemporary age; yet his poetry has perhaps failed in essential generosity and good humor, in steady compassion for the human lot. Nor has its austerity resulted from arid religious opinions; it was more austere before Eliot's Christian beliefs supervened, and they have been refreshing, though indeed they sprang from the brackish waste places of his young manhood.
>
> • • •
>
> Few good poets, and never the greatest, have depicted only their own range of emotions; their art has rather consisted in reconstructing, imitatively, both the emotions they have had and those they have divined. In no play and in hardly more than one poem of Eliot's, the youthful "Portrait of a Lady," is there pure realization of external character. The technical lesson of his poetry may lie in the futility of his repeated labor to reach the impersonal through dramatic camouflage; for of all expedients the dramatic monologue, so long as it draws its subject matter from interior suffering, has the least necessity or opportunity for diversifying its point of view.

The final sentence in the book is, I think, a sound counter to the too insistent admirer of Eliot (though the fact of Eliot's stature is surely not to be denied); Professor Smith concludes that

> even at its grandest, surveying in *Four Quartets* a peopled cosmos, Eliot's strange, private vision still faces inward to the isolated self. Sometimes a poet may learn by action, by accidental experience, to bring into his craft proper the passions of all sorts and conditions of men. Eliot, great though much of his poetry is, was not this fortunate.

I do not find it illuminating to learn that "Portrait of a Lady" is "apparently the result of a Cambridge friendship with a lady since described gratuitously by Aiken as a 'précieuse ridicule,' . . ." nor to be told that Sweeney may have been modeled upon a Boston Irishman named Steve O'Donnell, "who gave Eliot boxing lessons and once a black eye. . . ." But on the whole the book is free both from excessive attention to the biographical and from the vexing contemporary habit among critics of using the poem as a document for illustrating the intelligence of criticism! It will probably please Eliot's literary foes, who seem to be on the increase; it will also give pause to uncritical admirers of the great man. To friends between these extremes, it will surely seem (though not brilliantly written) a sound and sensible estimate and a genuinely useful guide.

WALLACE A. BACON
Northwestern University

IT SEEMS LIKE YESTERDAY. By H. V. Kaltenborn. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1956; pp. 221. $5.95.

The suggestion for *It Seems Like Yesterday* was made by Mr. Kaltenborn's publisher who had enjoyed the commentator's television program of the same name. The book is Kaltenborn's first since *Fifty Fabulous Years* published in 1950 and ably reviewed by Professor Giraud Chester in *QJS* for April 1951.

The current volume is at once more than, less than, and the same as the earlier work. It is *more* than its predecessor in the years covered (sixty this time, 1896-1954) and the number of illustrations (211, better than one per page of literal text). It is *less* in its number of pages (312 in *Fifty Fabulous Years*). And it is the *same* in its vices which Professor Chester noted. Once again Kaltenborn gives us "a highly superficial and sketchy account" and "a thoroughly expurgated account of a record of commentary . . . without so informing the reader."

In two to four well-illustrated pages each, Kaltenborn writes on sixty-two events or personalities prominent in the world's news from Bryan's 1896 campaign to the Supreme Court's 1954 decision on segregation. When so much is

attempted in so little space, the results cannot be history; causes are inadequate or overstated, events are skeletal or overly bold, and results are exaggerated or unqualified.

Kaltenborn's selection of topics is good; few events of small consequence are included, and few happenings of significance (the Marshall Plan is a notable exception) are excluded.

The illustrations are excellent. Many speakers are included; Bryan, Haile Selassie, Mussolini, Franklin Roosevelt, Landon, Edward VIII, Willkie, Truman, Mossadegh, and Kaltenborn, himself, are pictured on the platform or behind a microphone.

Several ideas and suggestions set forth by Kaltenborn may be of concern to people in the several areas of speech. In mentioning *Inherit the Wind*, he urges "more such plays based on . . . dramatic personal conflicts in American history." In discussing Marconi, he observes that "it is only due to radio and television that our people have . . . learned to accept and support the larger role that the United States has come to play in world affairs." In describing a radio interview with Landon in 1936, Kaltenborn argues that the use of interviews in lieu of addresses "would make half the campaign speeches infinitely more effective with the listeners."

Kaltenborn frustrates readers by mentioning events he does not develop. In 1897 he "bicycled . . . 100 miles" to hear Bryan. In the muckraking period he admired "the skill with which a young lawyer named Charles Evans Hughes cross-examined unhappy insurance executives." In his undergraduate years he heard Wilson "deliver a brilliant commencement address." In the late '20's he watched Al Smith on several occasions and "learned a great deal about how to win and hold a difficult audience." These quotations characterize Kaltenborn's abrupt treatment of the many speakers and speeches he cites.

I put myself in the category of Kaltenborn's grandchildren to whom he dedicates the volume with the sentiment that they are "old enough to enjoy the pictures, if not the text."

ROBERT P. FRIEDMAN
Purdue University

TELEVISION'S IMPACT ON AMERICAN CULTURE. Edited by William Y. Elliott. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1956; pp. 382. $4.95.

This multi-authored book turns out to be more of an informative and critical review of the status of educational television in the United States than a truly definitive work on *Television's Impact on American Culture*. Individual chapters do cite some possible changes television has wrought on the American character, on politics, and on entertainment, but the bulk of the book is concerned with the "problems, pitfalls and opportunities" of education by television. The editor's foreword is entitled "An Examination of the Educational Impact of Television," which would be a more descriptive title for the book. It is also stated in the foreword that "the authors entered this study without, on the part of most of them, any very fixed convictions, except that educational television programs of all sorts badly needed improving if they were to be of any real use and that commercial television, as presently organized, did not promise the remedy." This pretty well sets the tone for the text. Five of the eight authors write of educational television: the educational possibilities and limits of commercial television, the educational television stations, the Educational Television and Radio Center, educational television in America, and television and formal education. The editor spends the bulk of his introductory and concluding chapters on educational television also and concludes that, in spite of all the efforts spent toward educational television, the present situation is "parlous." He suggests that through community and private effort there be developed organized opinion toward the educational potential of television and that an adequately financed national council of real stature be formed to direct educational television activity and to gain support for public policy.

Other chapters deal with public policy and commercial broadcasting, the Canadian system (which seems out-of-place in this volume), politics and television, and television and the American character in which a psychiatrist looks at television. This latter article, though short, is probably the most provocative in the book. There is also a healthy set of appendixes including union rules, TV code, several reprints of articles on television and a listing of ETV station facilities and their total broadcast hours.

I think anyone who has a basic interest in the potential of education by television will want to read this book. The several authors write knowingly of their area assignments and offer some critical and thought-provoking comment. Perhaps the volume would have been improved if the editor had exhibited stronger editorial guidance and if he had laid a better foun-

dation in his introductory comments by defining precisely what he considers educational television to be and just how and why the articles in the text contribute significantly to the total "impact." There are some statements and statistics which are already outdated, but this is inevitable in writing of a dynamic medium like television. The book remains an informative, comprehensive, subjective report on the state of "educational television" in America during 1955-56.

GLENN STARLIN
University of Oregon

TEACHING SPEECH. By Loren D. Reid. Columbia, Mo.: The Artcraft Press, 1956; pp. xi+358. $4.85.

This is a revised edition of a book which appeared in 1952 under the title of *Teaching Speech in the High School*. The basic organization of subjects treated is much the same, although there have been some changes and additions. The topics of these chapters are well selected and in general are well covered. The appendixes contain supplementary forms for tests, and useful lists of sources of information.

Teaching Speech is announced in the foreword as a book for beginners. Professor Reid might have said that the book was written for the student. Both the content and manner of writing suggest a warm concern for the student. Perhaps it is the candid recitation of personal experience, the use of the friendly personal pronouns, or it may be the wise combination of scholarship and homely philosophy, but regardless of explanation the reader must feel that he has been taken to the heart of a man who writes as a great teacher and a friend.

The beginning teacher will find this book helpful as a source of information on many of his problems. Although the author limits himself only to those topics of interest to the young teacher which have not been developed previously in the literature, one of the qualities of this book is that it is systematic in its approach. No novice can long hold the point of view that speech is primarily debating, or theatre, or language, or any other fraction of the total. There is no attempt to review all the content of all the courses in the curriculum, although the rich bibliographies of source material provide the student whose work may have been sketchy in some area with a substantial introduction to subject matter.

Although the contents of this book are adaptable to teaching speech in various types of curriculums, its major orientation is to traditional course organization. Some of the types of controversial matters in modern education may have been wisely omitted as premature for the beginning student. The educational philosophy is generally sound. Some teachers with specialized contributions to speech education may question the adequacy of the treatment of their area or point of view. For example, the attitude expressed toward examinations is generally negative. We are told (p. 111) that excessive testing puts emphasis on theory. But we are not told what "excessive testing" is, or why an emphasis on principles is bad. Objective questions are criticized and some suggestions for item writing are given, but nowhere is item analysis, the generally accepted technique for evaluating test items, considered, nor are their values when well-developed, set forth.

The instructional method employed in *Teaching Speech* is the illustration or example. The content of this text is rich in the method of the master teacher. The illustrations add interest and emphasis to style as well as content. This book should be in the library of every beginning teacher of speech as well as those who have anything to do with the preparation of teachers.

FRANKLIN H. KNOWER
The Ohio State University

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL. Prepared by the Commission on the English Curriculum of the National Council of Teachers of English. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956; pp. xi+488. $4.00.

The Commission on the English Curriculum, established by the National Council of Teachers of English under the direction of Professor Dora V. Smith of the University of Minnesota, has undertaken the publication of five volumes defining the scope, purpose, methodology, and teacher-training problems of the language arts area from the primary school through college. This current book dealing with the curriculum of the secondary school is the third of the proposed five volumes to appear.

Like its predecessors, this volume proceeds from two basic assumptions about the language arts curriculum. The first assumption is that the area called language arts has the responsibility of providing students with a developmental program in each of the four communication skills of reading, speaking, writing, and listening. Thus this volume makes a serious, and generally successful, effort to overview current thinking on the content and method of high school instruction in each of these com-

munication skills. This assumption is likely to be generally accepted. Speech teachers, for example, will welcome the fact that this volume does not assume that skill in speaking is developed as an incidental by-product of the study of literature and writing. They will also welcome the fact that this volume points out the inevitable implication that the person professing to teach "language arts" needs college training in the field of speech.

The second basic assumption is that instruction in language skill must be activity-centered, and that student activity in reading, speaking, writing, and listening ought to be organized around a "central theme, or purpose, clear and significant to the student." This results in "units" of instruction—"units" in which instruction in all the communication skills is integrated. Classroom instruction develops a social situation in which all the language skills have a reason for being used. Activity is purposeful, and hence motivated. Proper planning and wise instruction have the duty of seeing to it that instruction in each language skill is neither incidental, nor hit and miss, but that students develop knowledge about language in a sequence appropriate to their capabilities.

The assumption that reading, speaking, writing, and listening ought to be studied together, in integrated units of instruction, is controversial. This volume will facilitate sense-making discussion of the unit concept through its clear and detailed illustration of this concept. It illustrates how teachers may use wisely concepts about language drawn from the traditional areas of rhetoric-as-composition and grammar. It reflects the thinking of persons interested in the study of literature, communication media, and symbolic behavior generally. The concepts about language provided by the fields of logic and rhetoric-as-persuasion go almost without notice.

DONALD K. SMITH
University of Minnesota

EDUCATING SPASTIC CHILDREN. By F. Eleanor Schonell. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956; pp. 257. $6.00.

Who chose the title for this book I do not know. Perhaps the author acceded to the choice only under a publisher's duress of "salability." It is a misleading title because more than one-half of the book (chapters 1-13) concerns a report of a research project on the intelligence and educability of 354 cerebral-palsied children in the West Midland area of England (Birmingham and surrounding counties) and a comparison of the results with a similar study in the Queensland (Australia) Spastic Children's Center. The central interest throughout the book is the significance of the research, not the substance or methods of educating spastic children.

The Birmingham study led to the establishment of the Carlson House Experimental School for Spastics where the predictions and conclusions of the psychological study could be tested further. The detailed reports, statistical tables, and graphs on the intelligence and educability of the cerebral palsied present a valuable addition to the body of information on this subject. Mrs. Schonell finds, for example, that "as the physical handicap increases, the tendency is for the mean I. Q. to fall"; "that five out of every ten cerebral palsied children are of dull, normal or above normal intelligence," but that "45 per cent of the cerebral palsy group have markedly lowered intelligence while about three to five per cent of the ordinary population are in this category." She points out a serious defect in educational planning in another conclusion: "The normally intelligent and very bright cerebral palsied child tends to be given insufficient opportunity and stimulus to develop his abilities beyond mediocre levels, unless special education is provided." A comparison of reading test scores and intelligence quotients supports Dr. Schonell's belief that the cerebral palsied child with normal or superior intelligence has not been motivated to use his intellectual power. All who have worked with cerebral palsied children recognize this need for enlarging the environment and enriching the experiences of this group. No child learns *in vacuo*.

The psychometric evaluations were based on one test, the Terman-Merrill revision of the Stanford-Binet, but in 89 of the 354 cases it was modified because of the physical and/or speech disabilities of the child. In addition to the "tested" and "modified" I. Q.'s, an "estimated" I. Q. also was made in each instance. Despite the modifications, the author says that the Terman-Merrill Intelligence Test was found to be "the most effective test for estimating the intelligence of cerebral palsied children." One wonders if the author was familiar with the Leiter International Intelligence Scale, the Nebraska Test of Learning Aptitude, and the Columbia Mental Maturity Scale. It would seem to this reviewer that any one of these measures would have been preferable to the Terman-Merrill test. Both the Leiter and the Nebraska tests are non-verbal, and the performance items have been adapted to the cerebral palsied, either

by those who devised the test or by other psychometricians. The original purpose of the authors of the Columbia Mental Maturity Scale was to meet the need for testing the physically handicapped, non-talking child.

The historical account of the habilitation of the cerebral palsied, covering the author's observation and experiences in several countries, is enlightening. Likewise, the author's discussion of the organization, staffing, and curriculum of the Carlson House School in Birmingham should be exceedingly helpful to those pioneering similar efforts in other countries. But if one hopes to find any detailed discussion of the substance and methods of educating the cerebral palsied—whether the field be speech, arithmetic, psychotherapy, or physiotherapy—he will be disappointed. As the author states in the preface, the book contains "information of an educational and psychological kind for all concerned with the education, upbringing and general welfare of the cerebral palsied." That it does do; it does not give us a program or a methodology for the education of spastic children. New title please!

MILDRED F. BERRY

Fulbright lecturer in speech pathology, 1956-57, U. S. Educational Foundation in Denmark

MIDDLE ENGLISH DICTIONARY. Part A. 3. Edited by Hans Kurath and Sherman A. Kuhn. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956; pp. 253-380. Offset. $3.00.

After some years of preparation involving adjustments of editorship and sponsorship as well as the careful work of many scholars who participated in reading and collecting material to be added to that collected for the *NED*, the new *Middle English Dictionary* began to appear in 1952 (Part E. 1). In 1954 a volume entitled *Plan and Bibliography* was issued to describe the history of the project and to explain the methods to be followed. In view of the complexity of the material, which presents such problems as the erratic orthography of Middle English texts, considerable dialect variation, and significant linguistic change of all kinds during the course of the Middle English period, the mechanical arrangement of the dictionary presented enormous difficulties. These problems are confronted with admirable judiciousness in the *Plan*, and the application of the principles there explained in the fascicles which have so far appeared promises a work of great usefulness. Entries are based on normalized forms of the SE Midland dialect and are followed where necessary by selected variants. A fuller range of variant forms is supplied in the quotations which illustrate each definition. Etymologies are confined to immediate sources. The definitions are very copiously illustrated with selected quotations which give the reader an excellent introduction to the semantic range of the entry. It may be remarked that the introductory observations in the *Plan* on the semantic limitations of a dictionary are excellent: no dictionary can reproduce the cultural and conceptual environment of the past, nor can it account fully for the vagaries of individual authors. Nevertheless, the present dictionary is full enough so that it will not only serve in the preliminary elucidation of texts; it will also be useful as a preliminary guide to scholars who seek to investigate special topics. Of interest to linguistic historians are the very full entries under common words. In the present fascicle, for example, there are over six columns of material on *and*. The ultimate goal envisaged by the editors is a dictionary of some 8,000 pages. Altogether, the editors and the University of Michigan which has sponsored the dictionary since 1930 are to be congratulated on their progress in making available the work of many scholars in a very useful form.

D. W. ROBERTSON, JR.
Princeton University

THE STUDY OF GROUPS. By Josephine Klein. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1956; pp. 200. $5.00.

This book, by a social psychologist at the University of Birmingham in England, is published as part of the International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction founded by Karl Mannheim—a series which includes an impressive and fascinating list of titles in the "sociology of" education, law, religion, industry, and other fields. *The Study of Groups* is an unusual book—one which attracted me immediately by its bibliography which, though relatively brief, contained what I regard as the very best from a variety of schools of thought which have relevance to group behavior—works from Freud, Fromm, Lewin, Carl Rogers, Chester Barnard, William F. Whyte, Alex Bavelas, Muzafer Sherif, Leon Festinger, Cartwright and Zander. But above all, I was attracted by the author's preface, which singled out for a special debt of gratitude the same two social scientists I happen to feel are most worthy of our attention—R. F. Bales and George C. Homans.

My initial positive responses were not in the least diminished as I read through Miss

Klein's book, for she has made a Herculean effort to construct an overall theory of group behavior based directly upon the experimental findings which have been accumulating from many sources during the past several years. Her uniqueness lies in the fact that unlike most social scientists who attempt to build general theories, she does not begin with a logically beautiful set of armchair constructs to which experimental or field data are then fitted, but actually starts with the data of others and, like a jig-saw puzzle player, attempts to piece them all together. In fact, she sets out as the primary purpose of her book simply "to acquaint the reader with the material which other workers have accumulated" and only secondarily expresses the "hope that in the course of the analysis . . . a fairly general theory of social life will gradually take shape."

That the net result of this book is not a coherent, easily comprehensible set of laws and principles is, in my opinion, no reflection whatsoever on the author's diligence, thoroughness, or clarity of thought. Rather it is testimony to the almost limitless complexity of the task. In her effort at scholarly precision she has been forced to present an unmanageable number of axioms, qualifications to these axioms, and supporting details, packed into 162 pages of text.

Although Miss Klein's treatment of some of the aspects of group behavior—for example, the evolution of norms and sentiments—does not go much beyond the work of Homans or Bales, her chapters on communication patterns bring together in an organized and helpful fashion, for the first time that I know of, the widely scattered segments of research in this difficult area.

This book would probably not be effective as a text for a course in group dynamics because it is too overpowering to be teachable. It contains, however, a wealth of reference material conveniently brought together in one place, and would be an invaluable addition to the library of anyone seriously interested in the study of groups.

FRANKLYN S. HAIMAN
Northwestern University

BRIEFLY NOTED

TRENDS IN 20TH CENTURY DRAMA: A SURVEY SINCE IBSEN AND SHAW. By Frederick Lumley. Fair Lawn, N. J.: Essential Books, 1956; pp. xii+275. $7.00.

It is difficult to explain the structure of this book, which seems almost haphazard, but I suspect that the guiding motif throughout is that twentieth-century drama as a whole is pretty bad because in one way or another it deals with despair, frustration, and futility. Mr. Lumley believes drama and theatre can only survive by "making the theatre part of our existence and an expression of the continuity of the life-force." After an introduction and an introductory chapter, the study of individual dramatists begins with Pirandello. It continues through sixteen rocky and tortuous chapters to end with Ugo Betti. Arbitrary, to be sure, but one must admit a sort of adventitious link —we start with an Italian, we end with one. A *Punch* reviewer of the original English edition called the treatment of contemporary French dramatists "perceptive" and that of Eliot "discriminating but sympathetic," whatever that may mean. I can only advise the reader to consult John Gassner or Eric Bentley or Harold Hobson's *English View* of 1953 on the Frenchmen, and almost anybody else than Lumley on Eliot. I must admit that it is pleasant to find Mr. Lumley thoroughly dissatisfied with O'Neill, Williams, and Miller, and to grant him one of his few successful hits in linking the last two as "Broadway Cortege." On the other hand it is at least questionable to devote some five pages midway of the book to Samuel Becket and to dismiss Sean O'Casey in two pages in an omnibus chapter. One is certainly startled to find a would-be critic writing of "Jan Van Druten" and "Bernhard Berenson."

The *Punch* reviewer was too kind to Mr. Lumley in calling his book one "which, taking the world for its oyster, is sometimes sketchy," and complaining only that he "can write carelessly, and his criticism can be very sweeping." Open the book at random and be confounded. If his criticism is "sweeping," I can only conclude that although to my knowledge Mr. Lumley's is a new critical broom, it never sweeps clean.

E. J. WEST
University of Colorado

ON HUMAN COMMUNICATION: A REVIEW, A SURVEY, AND A CRITICISM. By Colin Cherry. New York: The Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley and Sons, 1957; pp. xiv+333. $6.75.

Intended to serve as an introduction to a series of texts on communication (to be produced under the editorship of W. N. Locke, L. L. Beranek, and Roman Jakobson), we have here an appraisal of the relationships existing among the diverse studies of communication that may well be considered required reading

for courses in the physical nature of speech, language, and communication. Consisting of a series of essays dealing with linguistics, phonetics, semantics, psychology, logic, philosophy, speech analysis, and the mathematical theory of communication, this "little volume" by the Reader in Telecommunication at the University of London is not to be taken as lightly as the author sometimes makes it appear.

The book seems not to be addressed to "the general reader," as stated, but rather to the experts, "the professional crew," who are looking on and evaluating it as a presentation to a general readership. It is written with frequent wit and keen insight. One could expect a comment such as:

> "Meaning" is a harlot among words; it is a temptress who can seduce the writer or speaker from the path of intellectual chastity. There are many like her. Our language is fraught with . . . words of easy virtue . . .

from a writer who dedicates a book on human communication

To my dog, Pym.

JOHN B. NEWMAN
Queens College

THE ART OF READING ALOUD. By John Dolman, Jr. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956; pp. xi+292. $3.75.

This last work of the late John Dolman, Jr., is a significant addition to speech literature. It is more than a textbook, for it presents the personal, educational, and artistic philosophy of an inspiring teacher. Oral reading is perceived as an important instrument of personal and societal culture, as the sole medium through which we achieve real understanding of poetic art.

The book treats poetry almost exclusively, and this treatment is unique. Without suggesting that it is the most important element of poetry, Professor Dolman urges the student to "look for the music first, and the meaning (which is least likely to be left out) last." The third element, mood, is a "natural and important *part* of meaning itself." Scanning poetry for its musical form, however, is not carried out through traditional foot-meter schema, but through determining rhythmic patterns ("time signatures") and the variant accents and syncopations the poet introduces. The analogies to composition and conducting are thorough and helpful.

The chapters on poetic meaning compare with other standard writings; the explanation of free verse is one of the clearest I have read. This is an interpretation "text," not an "anthology." Professor Frank M. Rarig's foreword contributes to the philosophical and practical value of the volume.

ORDEAN G. NESS
The University of Wisconsin

RAINER MARIA RILKE: CREATIVE ANGUISH OF A MODERN POET. By W. I. Graff. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956; pp. x+356. $6.00.

Twenty-one, Rilke arrived in Munich in 1896 "without a home, without a church, without a familiar goal, without any kind of warm human attachment." Rilke hardly *liked* this lack of connection, but insisted on it as a creative necessity.

Professor Graff's study treats the many aspects of Rilke's "egocentric implacability": his isolation, his abandon, his pride which was an "excess of humility," his insight into space and movement, his concern with death and the occult. In his portrait of the inner man, Professor Graff has consciously followed only a vaguely chronological line. There is no attempt to show the man fully in his social relations: the boy dressed and treated like a girl for the pleasure of his mother, the miserable military cadet, the irresponsible father and husband, the charming seducer, the brilliant and fantastic correspondent, the tourist nervously pacing through a Europe which was always too hot, too cold, too damp, or too dry.

The reader of Professor Graff's book should nevertheless appreciate the appropriateness of his dwelling only on the inward significance of events to Rilke, whose vision of a social order was one "in which each stood watch over the completest freedom of the other."

DON GEIGER
University of California, Berkeley

THEODORE E. BURTON: AMERICAN STATESMAN. By Forrest Crissey. Cleveland and New York: World Publishing Co., 1956; pp. 352. $5.00.

Theodore E. Burton of Ohio (1851-1929) served for thirty years in Congress. His was the unique distinction of having served first

in the House (1889-91 and 1895-1909), then in the Senate (1909-15), again in the House (1921-29), and then again in the Senate (1929).

These were exciting years: the years of Populists and free silverites, of the "Square Deal" and the "New Freedom," of Bryan, "T.R.," LaFollette, and Woodrow Wilson. But this book does not communicate the excitement of those years—perhaps because Theodore E. Burton never felt it. He was, as the biographer says of his appointment to keynote the 1924 Republican convention, ". . . exactly the type to express the conservative views of Coolidge and he had been a loyal party man for years."

A greater fault of the book is that Burton never really comes alive—never assumes human dimensions—in its pages. The biographer is too obviously *en rapport* with his subject. Burton's mistakes, and for Crissey they were few, are explained only in terms of his virtues. Of vices he had none.

The reader interested in speechmaking will find scattered references to Burton's speaking. His appointment as President of the Merchant's National Bank on Wall Street is attributed in part to a belief that ". . . his ability as a public speaker would be invaluable to the institution." But this volume is not the place to look for a critical appraisal of personality, politics, or rhetoric.

VICTOR M. POWELL
Wabash College

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF PARLIAMENTARY LAW AND PROTOCOL. By Marguerite Grumme. St. Louis, Mo.: Marguerite Grumme, 1955; pp. 68. $1.00.

"Parliamentary Law is common sense used in a gracious manner" qualifies among the more hopeful definitions of parliamentary law. However, its author presents in this brief manual an impressive amount of sound information on planning and conducting meetings. The parliamentary section is restricted by the necessary brevity of the explanations, while the lists of rules of protocol suffer from dogmatic assertions on such things as guest seating, how to hand a gavel back and forth, and "gracious" behavior of members.

Although the speech teacher can find little classroom use for this manual, he can recommend it as an abbreviated parliamentary dictionary and a pocket Emily Post for service clubs, occasional organizations, or regional and national conventions.

CHARLEY A. LEISTNER
Oberlin College

A CASEBOOK IN STUTTERING. By Charles Van Riper and Leslie Gruber. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957; pp. 149. $2.50.

This is a casebook, setting forth one individual—Abraham Goldman, who happens to stutter—as a focal point in an inquiry into the etiology, nature, and psychological effects of stuttering. Goldman's problem is examined from several etiological points of view: psychological, emotional, respiratory, and neurological. No conclusions as to etiology are set forth—Mr. Van Riper continues to hold his chair of eclecticism.

There are several factors considered which make this casebook extremely valuable for classes of beginning students (for which purpose it was intended). The section on interviewing and diagnosis is excellent; and the revelation to the beginner of forms for testing or appraising motor skills, emotional factors, diadochokinesis, rhythmokinesis, the stutterer's self-appraisal, and secondary symptoms is of marked importance. One of the most advantageous features of the work is an extensive bibliography with questions to assist the beginner in interpreting information.

There is an obvious attempt to make this book palatable to the undergraduate. The hypothetical clinic director, for example, often verbalizes in undergraduate "jargon," and several discussion periods are presented in the form of "bull sessions" in sundry locations, including the campus coffee shop. These same techniques were used in Mr. Van Riper's earlier *Casebook in Speech Therapy* and elicited the same feeling of dismay from this reviewer.

RICHARD A. HOOPS
Ball State Teachers College

A PICTORIAL HISTORY OF BURLESQUE. By Bernard Sobel. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1956; pp. 194. $5.95.

In text and pictures Mr. Sobel reviews the development of American burlesque from its beginnings in the 1860's to its lowly state today. Born of the combination of minstrel show, variety, drama, and extravaganza, plus remnants of the English opera burlesque, this composite form reached its peak in the early years of this century when it served as "the poor man's clubhouse." The author credits burlesque with making a rich contribution of comedy to

the theatre and nurturing many leading comedians of today and yesterday. In the last several decades, as the "strippers" took an increasingly important role, the comic has been reduced to being a mere filler between strip numbers, and burlesque has fallen to its present status of "outcast entertainment."

The theatre student will find a potpourri of information supplemented by numerous anecdotes, sprinkled with personal opinion and nostalgia, and liberally garnished with photographs, all combined with easy readability to make a light and tasty if not overly filling dish.

JOHN A. WALKER
Michigan State University

BUSINESS SPEAKING: A TEXT AND WORKBOOK. By James F. Clyne, Charles A. Dwyer, Edward J. Kilduff, and Ralph M. Zink. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956; pp. xvi+233. $3.75.

This combination text and workbook attempts to present both the necessary principles and a course of instruction in one cover. While it does a fairly good job, with admittedly brief treatment of principles, it falls short of the necessary minimum for most of the items treated, while it spends an unusually large number of pages (about one-third of the book) under Part II, Speech Improvement. In this part, the authors treat grammar, articulation, voice, and other aspects of delivery in much greater detail than is usually the case in "business" speech courses.

The book is aimed at undergraduates in schools of business and in liberal arts, others interested in business speaking, and business people themselves who are taking in-service training courses in their companies. For the former, the lack of depth in Part I, Speech Assignments, would make the text of questionable value for college courses. Though such courses should be "practical," the student should have a greater understanding of speech purposes, organization, and other essential matters. The organization of this material is also open to question, for projects start with the speech to convince, then action, then exposition; and under the latter the use of forms of support and evidence is treated briefly for the first time. For both the undergraduate and the businessman, it would be better if the projects were concerned with more typical business speaking situations, such as reports, public relations, and interviews. The criticism sheets are well worked out.

HAROLD P. ZELKO
The Pennsylvania State University

COMMUNICATION: HANDLING IDEAS EFFECTIVELY. By Roy Ivan Johnson, Marie Schalekamp, and Lloyd A. Garrison. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956; pp. x+361. $4.50.

The authors of *Communication* offer their book to the teacher who wishes to move away from a "program of fragmented language skills" to a program "which relates all the component skills to the experiences of living." Discussions of telephone speaking, social letter writing, reading for pleasure, and listening to the radio (as well as the more formal communication activities) suggest the breadth of the authors' concept of a beginning course in communication. Because the book is so inclusive, each specialist who examines it will probably feel that his area is slighted. This reviewer thinks, however, that specialists in spoken communication might with considerable justification wish that the fine chapter on discussion had a companion on public address. What little is said of public speaking makes it seem too easy.

Valuable chapters are included as background for the sections on technique. Two chapters deal with orientation to college and studying, another with functions of language, and one with "What Your Mind Does With Ideas."

EDWARD ROGGE
University of Missouri

SPEAKING BEFORE AN AUDIENCE. By Richard T. D. Hollister. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Braun-Brumfield, Inc., 1955; pp. ix+531. $3.75.

Professor R. D. T. Hollister, onetime colleague of Thomas C. Trueblood, taught at the University of Michigan from 1904 to 1949. The fact that this book was published in 1955, six years after his retirement, shows his continuing love of his profession. One might call this book the afterthoughts of a useful life on matters pertaining to his profession. Many of us know and have used his *Making a Speech* and his *Literature for Oral Interpretation*. How happy those who know Dr. Hollister are to have his insights into the problems involved in speaking and reading further recorded in this volume.

The temptation to quote is great, but space forbids. The serious student of speech will want to have a copy of this work from one of the distinguished teachers of our profession who refuses to quit thinking and writing about the problems of speaking and reading before an audience.

LIONEL CROCKER
Denison University

SHOP TALK

RICHARD MURPHY, *Editor*

On Retiring

When his office-mate retired two years ago, ST aged a decade. Through the years he had been the young man, answering the telephone, sorting the mail, fending off the bookmen, making brash criticisms of his colleague's writings—all in all, keeping up a good pretense of having abounding, youthful energy. But when he moved over to the Old Man's desk by the window, and the department chaplain dropped by to intone, "The mantle of Elijah hath fallen upon him, and it doth become him," ST knew he faced sheer, stark reality. He determined to conduct himself thenceforth in some dignity, guarding his speech, running fewer errands, and devoting some time to the science of geriatrics and the art of growing old gracefully.

"Old age is one last, wonderful fling at living," declares the president of the National Retirement Council, and ST decided to plan to live it up. He began to inquire, and to observe. Three of his favorite companions at The Club are retirees. One, a librarian, is 86 years old, and has been retired for 16 years. He can still shinny up a tree to trim the lower branches. A man of many interests, he belongs to the National Society for the Preservation of Covered Bridges, Inc., and keeps a list in his car. On tour, he doesn't mind going fifty miles or so out of his way to cross a covered bridge, determined, as he does so, to do what he can to keep it there for ever and ever. Of course he has slowed up a bit. The 3,000,000 volume bibliothèque over which he used to preside gets more and more complicated, and he really prefers the little town library for his own reading and borrowing. He was a bit out of sorts the other day. He had had several teeth pulled, and they were the ones he had used to clamp his pipe. The second favorite club companion is a retired electrical engineer. He's been off the active list for 13 years, and is now 82. Three days a week he reads his way through newspapers and periodicals in the club library, and is an encyclopaedia of information. The other day he said he didn't want his name sent in to one of those quiz programs; he is about to drive to Florida to visit his ninety-nine-year-old sister. The car he will use is the Cadillac he bought 19 years ago and is not yet near retirement. The third favorite companion is an eighty-year-old ecologist. He stayed on in his quarters in the herbarium, researching and writing. He is probably the busiest man on the campus, never allowing himself more than fifty minutes at lunch, when he must get back to work while the younger men are having a second cup of coffee and a cigar. The other day he sent off to his publishers the *ms.* of a three-volume work. The package, with wrappings, weighed 14 pounds, he said.

But this is the rosy side. To get that last fling, one has to live to retirement, and then have something to live on. ST was cautious about prying into age and retirement incomes, but he found retirees willing to talk, proud of their age, and rather puzzled about the smallness of their annuities. The state of income for people retired is difficult to figure. One can divide the total number

of members of a retirement system into the total amount paid out, but that does not tell how long each person may have been in the system, or what other sources of income, such as royalties and part-time work, may be available. But it is clear that the picture is rather sad. There are distinguished members of our profession officially retired on less than a hundred a month. One man retired on half of that, but luckily he had got into Social Security, and the supplement from that pulls him through. Another converted his house into apartments, and does better now than when a member of his college faculty.

Retirees of the University of Colorado recently decided to do something about the situation, and organized into Colorado Senior Faculty Associates. First of all, they surveyed to see what the situation is. They found that the retirement allowance ranges from $213.00 a month to the guaranteed minimum of $100.00. Average annuity is $138.15, for a group of retirees averaging 30 years of service. The report is realistic: "Some of the retired group are near the subsistence level—one member has been cared for by the County Hospital for months; few have been able to travel and do what they had hoped for in retirement; a long illness would leave most in debt beyond ability to pay." The plight of the widows is still being investigated; some received nothing from their husbands' retirement plans. ST salutes the CSFA and *The Colorado Alumnus*, which carried the story, and exposed the situation. At another school a retired member worked up a similar set of statistics but could not get the alumni journal to carry it. The editor thought it would reflect on the dignity of the university. Walter M. Campbell is president of CSFA, and Mrs. Arthur Cross is secretary, in case you want to get in touch.

Supreme Court Justices have a comfortable plan—retirement at seventy on full pay, $35,000. A master sergeant in the Army draws $251.55 after 30 years of service, and he doesn't have to have a Ph.D. Bill S. 607, passed by the Senate, would give a retired President of the United States $25,000 per annum, a secretarial staff, and offices in Washington. Seems the Presidents have been neglected even as the professors. A few figures from the more optimistic plans should be given. The University of Wisconsin recently issued a survey made by the Staff of Governor's Retirement Commission. A few samples:

School	*Monthly Retirement Pay after 35 years of service, age 65*
California	$303.80-$531.65
Michigan	330.33- 509.51
Syracuse	330.33- 509.51
Illinois	233.33- 375.00
Wisconsin	228.85- 311.30

The plans average from 56% of final salary to 68%, for 35 years' service. Averages for the Big Ten are 54% to 64%.

Since everyone has been so frank and open about all this, ST will reveal his own situation. He pays 6% of his salary into the system, and at age 65 can retire on 38-1/3% of the average of his highest consecutive five years' pay. He will be just a bit over that master sergeant in amount. The system isn't funded, doesn't make allowance for inflation, and the local AAUP says it may be broke in 20 years. Oh, well! Live dangerously, even as a professor.

We seem to have got off on mere money, and have neglected other fundamental matters such as health, adjustments, getting the spouse to go along with plans, the proper age of retirement, where to retire to, and so on. But as a final bit of advice, let old ST, who has aged even more while preparing this, say to that young instructor in New York who is living so gaily on $4,400 a year, "It is later than you think."

Now, the former office-mate, having got us onto this subject, will have to get us off. Here is the counsel of Wayland Maxfield Parrish, as culled from a recent letter, on prospects of retiring to Florida for that last fling:

> Anyone who has been thrown out of the academic profession because of age and decrepitude might do worse than start a new career in Florida. Tastes differ I know, but to me it seemed best to make a clean break with the old environment where one could only expect to be regarded as a has-been, the last leaf on the tree, the object of kindly but condescending pity. Florida, with its mild climate, is a good place to enjoy what the late Professor Winans told me was the chief desideratum of retirement—the ability to look a clock in the face and tell it to go to hell. A good place, too, for another important desideratum—the ability to keep "gently occupied." Fishing and gardening I suggest as the most congenial occupations. They may be pursued either casually or seriously. To learn the various tribes of fish, where they loaf, their preferred diet and meal schedule, and how to entice them into a boat and

prepare them for the table may absorb as much or as little time as one cares to give. And if one goes in for the propagation of peas, parsnips, pickles, peppers, parsley, pinks, pansies, and petunias he may soon find himself involved in a lifetime study of climates, soils, fertilizers, diseases, pests, and sprays. But let no one expect to make a living from such enterprises unless he has plenty of capital to invest and is prepared to lose it all in one swoop. The cost of living is about as high as in the north and the consumer's dollar shrinks daily. What is needed is a nation-wide pressure group to resist inflation. Pensioners of the world, unite! My advice to retirees is to save enough money (out of what?) to keep yourself afloat for twenty years. After that you may be too far gone to care much.

Invitation

From June to September the October Shop Talk will be assembled in leisurely fashion, since the editor has a summer off, for a change, and plans to go into semi-retirement.

Please send on your news as you discover it. If items are classified on separate sheets—appointments on one, research projects on another, and revolutionary changes in curriculum on still another—copy can be sent to the printer handily without interfering with the individual style of the contributors.

Every self-respecting speech department should have its ST newsman listed in the 1957-58 budget, with more than a nominal rise for his extra duties.

Address: SHOP TALK—R. Murphy—204A Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Illinois.

Retirements—Class of '57

William G. B. Carson, Professor of English and Drama at Washington University, will retire in June. He has been on the faculty since 1919, when he returned to the university from Iowa State College. When a Division of Drama was established, he became the first chairman. He has been faculty advisor of Thyrsus, student dramatic organization. His interests are mainly in theatre and theatre history. He plans to spend his time in research, and in writing books such as his *The Theatre on the Frontier* (1932) and *Managers in Distress* (1949) and articles such as the one carried in this issue.

Dorothy Kaucher, Professor of Speech at San Jose State College, will retire in June. She has been at San Jose since 1930, teaching drama, public speaking, and interpretation. She plans to travel and write. She is the author of books covering her air travel, such as *On Your Left the Milky Way.*

Earl W. Wiley, Professor of Speech at Ohio State University, retired in March. He joined the staff in 1915, and has served continuously for 42 years. His main interests have been in classical rhetoric and interpretation. A recognition banquet was held for him at the Faculty Club. He is going to write and travel.

Robert Williams, Professor of Speech at DePauw University, retires in June, after 36 years with the school. He will stay on for part-time teaching. His main interest has been interpretation.

Shop Talk Speech Convention Calendar

National

Speech Association of America: Hotel Statler, Boston, August, 25-28. (1958: Hilton, Chicago, December 29-31; 1959: Statler, Washington, December 28-30; 1960: The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30.)

American Educational Theatre Association: meets with SAA in the late summer meeting. (1958: with SAA in Chicago; 1959: with SAA in Washington; 1960: with Children's Theatre Conference in Denver, August; 1961: with CTC in New York, August.)

American Speech and Hearing Association: Netherland-Hilton, Cincinnati, November 20-22. (1958: New York, November 13-15; 1959: Cleveland, November 12-14.)

The Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials and Interstate Co-operation, National University Extension Association: Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, December 27-28. The committee breaks its tradition of meeting with SAA because of the August convention.

Regional

Central States Speech Association: Hotel Leamington, Minneapolis, April 5-6; Hotel Sherman, Chicago, December 27-28.

Speech Association of the Eastern States: Sheraton-McAlpin Hotel, New York, April 11-13.

Southern Speech Association: University of Georgia, Athens, April 1-6.

Shop Talk Convention Calendar—Related Organizations—1957

American Association of University Professors Annual Meeting: New Yorker Hotel, New York, April 26-27.

American Students Constitutional Convention —sponsored by the Alexander Hamilton Bi-

centennial Commission: Philadelphia, Congress Hall, June 18-21.

International Conference on Audiology: Chase Hotel, St. Louis, May 13-16.

International Voice Conference: Chicago, May 20-22.

Modern Language Association: Annual Meeting, Madison, Wisconsin, September 9-11.

National Catholic Theatre Conference: Municipal Auditorium, Kansas City, June 13-15.

National Council of Teachers of English: Leamington Hotel, Minneapolis, November 28-30.

Pi Kappa Delta National Convention: South Dakota State College, Brookings, April 15-19.

Phi Rho Pi National Convention: Bakersfield College, Bakersfield, California, April 18-20.

Tau Kappa Alpha National Conference: Butler University, Indianapolis, April 15-17.

With the Emeriti

In his preoccupation about retirement, ST got to thinking about what has happened to members of the profession who have retired. He decided to find out. He drew upon his own memory in making a list, and wrote to various people who might give clues. So far as he has been able to get in touch, the reply has been prompt. Truly it has been said that if you want to get something done, get a busy man to do it. But the retirees seem to be a bit footloose; a letter to Connecticut brings a reply from St. Louis, and an inquiry to New Jersey gets a response from Florida. So far we are not in touch with such retirees as A. Craig Baird of Iowa, Lee Emerson Bassett of Stanford, and Alice Mills of Mt. Holyoke. We asked each of the emeriti to give some details and his best advice to the younger members. Here is what we collected:

C. L. Meader, Michigan '39. Professor Meader officially retired at age 70 and is now 89 or 90, he can't quite remember which. He continues to teach extension courses in Detroit and Ann Arbor, in General Semantics. Several years ago he co-authored, with J. H. Muyskens, *Handbook of Biolinguistics,* a 350 pp. book selling for $10.00. He has another book on semantics about ready for the press. Professor Emeritus Meader advises younger people to keep up their intellectual interests. He himself collects stamps, reads a number of current journals, and raises his own vegetables. Address: 1908 Pontiac Street, Ann Arbor.

Lane Cooper, Cornell '43. Professor Cooper retired at 68, and is now 81. Since retirement he has spent time on his farm, and in writing and revising his works. Several years ago a group of his former pupils established the Hertz-Cooper Fund to help in the printing of scholarly works, and particularly to provide for reprinting of many of Professor Cooper's works. Cornell University Press currently has 19 of his books in print. Address: 123 Roberts Place, Ithaca.

Gertrude E. Johnson, Wisconsin '44. She retired at 67 and is now 80. After teaching ten years at Illinois and Syracuse, she was at Wisconsin for 34 years. She lives with a retired colleague, Harriet E. Grim, in a home they own. Professor Johnson advises we should put our heart and soul in our teaching, start saving early, and expect the biggest payment in the gratitude of students. Address: 425 Holly Avenue, Madison 5.

George F. Reynolds, Colorado '45. Professor Reynolds retired at 68 and is now 79. He has been continuously teaching, writing, lecturing. He was at the University of Chicago for a year, then at New York University, University of Hawaii, Columbia University, Shakespeare Institute (Stratford on Avon) of the University of Birmingham. The fall semester he taught full-time at Colorado, replacing a younger man on sick leave. He says "being continually busy is the great solution." Address: 1220 Grandview Avenue, Boulder.

Frank M. Rarig, Minnesota '48. He retired at 68, and is now 77. After retirement he taught at the University of Utah, and for five years at the University of Missouri. He is rather settled down now, receives visits from children and grandchildren, visits them, and does a lot of reading. He has the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* sent in daily. He says his post-retirement teaching was very enjoyable. "Keep up your membership in SAA," he advises, and so he has. Address: 111 Orlin Avenue, S.E., Minneapolis 14.

R. D. T. Hollister, Michigan '49. He retired at 70 and is now 78. In 1955 he published *Speaking Before an Audience,* to express some of his newer ideas not carried in his older works. He suggests that retired professors should be put into a reserve pool to be drawn upon in emergency. About retirement he says: "I have missed the pleasures of meeting with fine students. I have been especially happy to be free from the mechanics of examinations, marks, and academic tinkering." Address: 2096 South State Street, Ann Arbor.

J. Milton O'Neill, Brooklyn '52. Details are lacking, since he is on a national lecture tour. A picture post card from St. Louis says he will supply full information when he gets back

to his typewriter. Our Louisiana State reporter wrote the other day: "J. M. O'Neill spoke at a speech faculty luncheon on 'The Right to be Wrong,' a talk on civil liberties. Afterward he discussed his experiences in helping to organize the SAA. Upon visiting the present national office on the L.S.U. campus, he expressed amazement at the growth of the association and its expanded program." Address: Lakeville, Connecticut.

J. Walter Reeves, The Peddie School '53. He retired at 69 and is now 72. He and Mrs. Reeves have traveled a lot, and he has done some teaching in parliamentary procedure short courses. They are spending the winter in St. Petersburg. He writes: "I hope this information is adequate and will not have to be used for an obituary for many years; I am enjoying my retirement very much." Address: 110 Etra Road, Hightstown, N. J.

Samuel D. Robbins, Emerson College '53. Professor Robbins retired at 66 and is now 69. "Retired" is not quite accurate, since he is still active with the Massachusetts Division of Mental Hygiene, and still works 42 hours a week. He plans to retire from that position, however, at the end of the year. Address: 711 Pleasant Street, Belmont 78, Mass.

Louis M. Eich, Michigan '54. He retired to Florida at 66 and is now 68. He retired earlier than he had planned because of ill health, but the Florida sun is revitalizing him, and he writes a firmer hand than contemporary students. Address: 1932 Temple Drive, Winter Park.

J. Gordon Emerson, Stanford '54. He retired at 65 and is now 68. He began his college teaching at Kansas State College, where, except for a two-year break for army service, he taught until 1926. He says that he has done a lot of reading and a lot of resting since he retired. Pressed for advice, he replied that retirement is an individual matter and he is unwilling to generalize. Address: New Cardinal Hotel, Palo Alto.

Wayland Maxfield Parrish, Illinois '55. He retired at 68 and is now 70. For the past two years he has been visiting professor at the University of Florida. His counsels on retiring are printed earlier in the section. Address: 1831 N.W. 12th Road, Gainesville.

Mildred E. Adams, Institute of International Education '56. After retiring she went to California and toured for three months, and then went back to the Institute part-time. One of her jobs is looking after the educational fund of the Korean boy pianist, Tong Il Han. From 1927 until 1956, with an interim when the Student Federation took over, Miss Adams scheduled the international collegiate debates. Address: 1 East 67th Street at Fifth Avenue, New York 21.

George McCarty, Indiana State Teachers College '56. He retired at 66 and has grown no older. He began his teaching career at South Dakota State. He is now visiting professor at William and Mary, and writes that he is "enjoying his work immensely." He says he hesitates to give any advice, since he is only a freshman among the retirees. He attended the Chicago Convention in December. Address: William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

C. Agnes Rigney, State University Teachers College, Geneseo '56. She retired at 66 and is still making her plans. She says she is enjoying her leisure and just thinking it over. Address: 36 Main Street, Geneseo, New York.

MEMBERSHIPS EMERITI. The new constitution provides for emeritus membership. Those on the list will have full membership rights, including subscription to *QJS,* without payment of dues. A committee, with Wilbur E. Gilman as chairman, has made these recommendations: (a) emeritus membership be granted to those who have retired and have been members of SAA for 25 years; (b) when membership has not been continuous, 30 years be required; (c) where service to the profession has been unusual, emeritus standing may be approved without regard to years of membership. A number of details have to be worked out, but the Executive Secretary reports that he and a VP are at work on the matter, and after some amendments have been acted upon, they will be able to announce a list of emeriti. A section of emeriti in the Directory would not only lend dignity to our profession, but would be very useful. Many retired members are not listed now.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL COMMEMORATION—AMERICAN STUDENTS CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION. In the December issue, Shop Talk reported plans to have a student congress in Philadelphia, conducted by the Advisory Committee on Contests and Awards, Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission. Senator Karl E. Mundt is chairman of the Commission, and Bower Aly, University of Missouri, 115 Switzler Hall, is chairman of the Advisory Committee. The dates have now been set for the congress, June 18-21. Complete expenses of one high school student from each state and commonwealth will be paid by the Commission.

The student congress will convene on the 170th anniversary of a famous Hamilton speech at the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

Each of the 55 delegates (the same number as at the convention of 1787) will receive an award of $1000 for his college education, and the college he selects will receive the same amount. At the Convention, 13 fellows will be selected on the basis of their performance and a written examination on the Constitution. The fellows will receive an additional $2000 award, as will the colleges they select. Each of the fellows will be designated to represent an original colony, as Fellow from New York. A similar congress for college students will be held next year.

Various books and materials are available, and a bibliography has been prepared by Miss Amie-Louise Bishop of the University of Colorado. For information, write to Chairman Aly. It's worth writing just to get a reply on the official stationery, which has a steel engraving of the man being honored.

Conventions

The 11th Biennial Convention of the National Catholic Theatre Conference will be held in Kansas City, June 13-15. Special trains will be run from Chicago, Minneapolis, and St. Louis. The Rev. R. A. Johnston, S.J., of St. Louis University, vice-president of the group, is convention chairman. The Conference was founded in 1937, in Chicago. There are 600 chapter members and 2,100 student members. *Catholic Theatre*, official journal, has a circulation of 3,000. Sister Mary Angelita, B.V.M., of Davenport, Iowa, is president of the Conference.

Pi Kappa Delta's annual convention in April provides for business meetings and events in oratory, debate, extemporaneous speaking, and discussion. John Randolph, sponsor of the Westminster, Missouri, Chapter is convention chairman. South Dakota State College at Brookings is the host school. Secretary D. J. Nabors predicts attendance from five hundred to a thousand. By January of this year 30,039 memberships in Pi Kappa Delta had been approved; 17,423 keys have been issued.

An International Voice Conference will be held in Chicago, May 20-22. Delegates representing interests in laryngology, physiology, physics, and voice science will attend. The first day, attention will be given to research on the physiology of voice production, the second, to clinical procedures in diagnosis and training, and the final day, to the relations of hearing and voice. Details can be procured from Dr. Hans von Leden, 30 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago 2.

Some of the highlights at the Central States meeting in Minneapolis, April 5-6, are: a demonstration of choric interpretation of literature by Macalester College Drama Chorus; University of Minnesota theatre production of *A Midsummer-Night's Dream;* a clinical demonstration of treatment of aphasia, at Veterans Administration Hospital; a demonstration of "brainstorming."

With all this talk about time and nature of conventions, ST dropped in to the national headquarters of the American Society for Engineering Education, the other day, to see how they do it. The group is renowned for its conventions family-style. The meeting this year will be at Cornell University, June 17-21, in the break between terms so housing will be available. Members are encouraged to live casually; a sport shirt is adequate except for the banquet. An apartment for three to five persons rents for $2.50 each person per day. Programs for spouses and the children are provided, including swimming parties, a trip to the Corning Glass Works, and a Chicken Barbecue Picnic at Taughannock Falls. Information on tent sites and camp cabins is being supplied. The office reports sentiment for family-style conventions is increasing through the years. Attendance is predicted at 2,500 members, 800 spouses, and 400 children.

A slightly different style will be used for the Mississippi Valley Academic Deans meeting on May 9-10. ST's dean is the host and gladly supplied some pertinent details. It will be a leisurely meeting at Allerton Park, in a Georgian mansion given to the University, thirty miles off campus, along the Sangamon. The deans will have 1,685 acres for their walks, and a choice of sunken gardens, hidden gardens, and just ordinary vegetable gardens. Or if they should feel academic, they have a choice of three libraries in the manor house. Cost is $8.00 a day per person for room and meals. Twenty-five deans and their ladies are expected. But no children. The deans, it should be explained, are not taking advantage of their position in order to get the choice surroundings. The retreat is available to any small conference group, and in fact is a favorite of trade union members for short courses.

In chatting about trends in conventions, the

dean, an MLA man himself, noted the increased number of conventions being held during regular session time, as opposed to holidays such as Thanksgiving and Christmas. ST raised the question of University Statute 27 (e), which required that any member of the faculty who wished to absent himself from campus during session must have administrative approval. The dean replied that he had a drawer full of forms for reports of absentees, but he hadn't seen one filed for years. The point wasn't pressed, but ST got the impression that a member of the faculty who went to a convention once a year during the regular sessions, all classes provided for, of course, wouldn't run into serious trouble. The dean concurred that Christmas is a rather pleasant time to be home with the family rather than on the road or in a smoke-filled convention room.

NEW JOURNAL. Vol. I, No. 1, *Journal of Broadcasting*, was issued in February. It is sponsored by the Association for Professional Broadcasting Education. Robert E. Summers, University of Southern California, is editor. The issue contains, in addition to articles, reviews, and notes, a list of courses in radio and television given in colleges and universities. Subscription price is $5.00 a year, with a student rate of $4.00.

SUBVERSION. Learning that the House Committee on Un-American Activities had issued a revised *Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications*, with 180 organizations added to the old list, ST hurried off a request to Francis E. Walter, Chairman, for a copy. It came back by return mail, with a personal letter commending your reporter for his interest. It's quite a document, running to pp. 152+xviii. Diligent reading reveals that this department is clean as a hound's tooth. There is a Jefferson society on the list, but *The Thomas Jefferson Parliamentarian* escapes. Five "theatre" groups are suspect, several playhouses, and two actors' groups. But no "official" speech group is included. There are 628 organizations and 105 publications on the *index prohibitorum*. Your favorite Congressman will send you a copy.

THE INTEREST GROUPS. One would expect the Parliamentary Procedure Interest Group to be well organized and well run, and indeed it is. A month following the December meeting, *The Thomas Jefferson Parliamentarian*, Vol. II, No. 1, was in the mails. Editor Joseph F. O'Brien had assembled a list of officers and committees for the coming year, minutes of the business meetings, summaries of convention papers, and news and notes. Everything in order.

ST has never been clear about who belongs to what interest groups, although he has scanned the constitution on the matter. He seems to be on some lists of groups in which he has only a casual interest, whereas he hears nothing from other groups he regards as fundamental in his life. An appeal to Executive Secretary Braden brings the reply that he is a bit confused himself, but that he is working on the problem and will shortly "write the members about the interest groups and attempt to make up lists of interested members for the various interest group chairmen." It does seem clear, however, that a member of SAA may belong to as many groups as he wishes, and without fee beyond the SAA dues.

In full confidence that none of the groups will be listed in the *Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications*, ST hereby publicly requests he be made a member of all groups, or at least be put on the mailing list. He would like to report from time to time on what is happening in the areas.

THE VOLUMES. Newcomers to the Association may not know that four scholarly studies have been officially sponsored, and that four more are on the way. (1) Studies on the Issues of Anti-Slavery and Disunion, 1858-1861, will be published by Harper and Brothers. Some of the manuscripts are now in final form. J. Jeffery Auer is chairman of the project. (2) The volume of studies in the Colonial Period of American Public Address is coming along. All contributors have been selected, and the first draft of one of the essays has been turned in. George V. Bowman is chairman of the committee. (3) For the volume in Southern Oratory, Dallas C. Dickey, chairman, reports that contributors have been selected, and manuscripts are expected within a year-and-a-half. (4) At the December meeting, Council approved a series of studies on the Speaking of the Age of the Great Revolt, 1870-1898. Lindsey Perkins is chairman.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE. A new table of contents and index for the three SAA publications is about ready to go to press, Franklin H. Knower, the compiler, reports. Speed the day! The last index was issued in 1952. As Professor Brigance pointed out in his review of Gray's *Index*, in the last issue of our journal, the Knower index is made on a different set of classifications, and is still of great usefulness. And, of course, the

Gray *Index* is for *QJS* only, and does not include *The Speech Teacher* or *Monographs*.

LEW SARETT. A memorial collection of books in honor of Lew Sarett was dedicated at the University of Florida in January. Lester Hale came down from Ohio, where he is on leave, to make the dedicatory speech. Present at the ceremony was Mrs. Sarett, who is teaching at the University. The collection will be shelved in the seminar room, by a portrait of Sarett, who, it will be recalled, became Visiting Professor of Speech at Florida when he retired from Northwestern. A record of Sarett reading from his own poems is available from Clark Weaver, 1426 N.E. 7th, Gainesville. Price is $5.95.

Kenneth F. Damon, Associate Professor of Speech at the City College of New York, died of a cerebral hemorrhage, December 31. He joined the staff at City College in 1924. From 1931 he also taught at Yeshiva University, and from 1927-1933 he conducted special classes at Teachers College, Columbia University. He had been visiting professor in summer sessions at the University of Southern California and at Washington State College. From 1943 he was president of Johnson Consumer Industries, manufacturers and packagers of chemical products, and vice-president of Bower, Inc., pump and filter manufacturers. Mr. Damon was graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1923, and received the Ph.D. degree from Columbia. He was 57 years old.

Paul X. Knoll, Professor of Speech and Director of Debate at Oregon State College, died on January 4. He had a heart attack in December. He was graduated from Oregon State College in 1923, and was a charter member of the Delta Sigma Rho chapter. He maintained his interests in debate, directed the work at the college, and alternated with Kirt E. Montgomery in directing the state meetings of the Oregon High School Speech League. With Earl W. Wells he was author of *Extempore Speech—A Handbook*. He was 60 years old.

NOTICE. An SAA *ad hoc* Committee for Assistance to Foreign Universities has been approved. Martin Bryan of the University of Cincinnati is chairman. The committee hopes to collect books and materials for shipment to schools abroad in need of them. In many countries, colleges are unable to procure American materials because of the dollar shortage, even though they may have resources in their own currency. Chairman Bryan solicits help in making a list of institutions of higher learning which would appreciate assistance. Don't send materials yet—just names!

MENCKEN ABRIDGED. Raven I. McDavid, Jr., of Western Reserve, is working on an abridgement of H. L. Mencken's *The American Language*, and supplements, for Alfred A. Knopf, the original publisher. He would appreciate "information," as he puts it, "about statements of fact that are no longer completely accurate."

SALARIES. John Keltner of Kansas State College has completed his study of salary and employment policies in selected speech departments. Policies on summer employment, promotions, tenure, merit, appointment, and other fundamental matters are tabulated. Professor Keltner has given us permission to reprint parts of the report. Figures are based on questionnaires distributed last fall to 385 speech departments representative of various categories of size and type of support. Sixty-one per cent of the questionnaires were returned in usable form. Comparisons with NEA figures in the table below explain the relation between annual median 9 months speech salaries and salaries in general. Mr. Keltner makes the "subjective" observation that "the salaries of speech people are not what they should be." For further explanation of the NEA figures, see "More on Salaries," below.

		Speech	*NEA*
Professor	(A)	8000	7736
	(B)	7100	7300
	(C)	6500	6500
Assoc. Prof.	(A)	6300	6158
	(B)	6000	5900
	(C)	5500	5500
Asst. Prof.	(A)	5300	5162
	(B)	5400	5100
	(C)	4800	4700
Instructor	(A)	4200	4159
	(B)	4300	4100
	(C)	4000	3900

(A) State universities
(B) State colleges and teachers colleges
(C) Private and municipal colleges and universities

MORE ON SALARIES. The NEA figures used by Professor Keltner in his comparisons are, he explains in his report, taken from the National Education Association's *Research Bulletin*,

XXXIV, 3 October 1956. The entire issue is given to salaries paid and salary practices in universities, colleges, and junior colleges. If you want facts and figures at your fingertips, get a copy. It costs fifty cents. 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington 6, is the address.

For example, the increase in salaries in 1955-56 over 1954-55 was 6.4% in state universities, and 5.6% in nonpublic institutions. But plans for 1956-57 reveal that state universities will give a 3.8% increase, whereas the nonpublic hope for a 7.5% rise. In the 705 institutions reporting, median annual salaries for various jobs other than professorial were (in 1955-56):

Presidents	$11,314.00
Vice-presidents	10,467.00
Deans of colleges	7,495.00
Deans of students	7,080.00
Business managers	6,682.00
Directors of athletics	6,335.00
Head football coaches	6,183.00
Directors of admissions	6,127.00
Deans of men	5,983.00
Head basketball coaches	5,664.00
Head librarians	5,437.00
Registrars	5,230.00
Deans of women	5,200.00

THE IVY LEAGUE. Getting ready for spring, ST was looking over some fashion notes the other day, particularly on styles in the Ivy League. It's been twenty-odd years since he left the league for the minors, and is a bit out of touch, although he has managed to preserve that essential casual look—at times, perhaps, too casual. He was horrified to discover that his favorite garb, "cloth jacket with ribbed bottom and cuffs," is "simply not seen on an Ivy campus." But the matter of immediate interest is this: "Most clubs, sports and even activities have their own special ties—even the Debate Council." ST got off a hurried inquiry to Harvard to see what is up. It's true. The Harvard tie is a black four-in-hand, silk, with diagonal white pin stripes. It costs $2.50, and may be worn only by regular members of the Debate Council. ST's correspondent added the information that tuxedo is still worn in the Harvard-Yale-Princeton Triangular Debate each spring, and that the judges "genially conform."

SEMANTIC LAYERS. *The Reporter* of December 13 carries some very interesting notes on discussion in the UN General Assembly. As the author, Marya Mannes, points out, "in the whole of this magnificent slab of glass there is not one window open." She observes, in analogy, that seldom are the windows of the mind flung open:

> What you hear in debate is an echo of an echo of an echo: The words are at sixth remove from the ear.
>
> Wrapping the substance of a speech are these layers:
>
> First, the delegate is not speaking for himself but for his absent government. In the Soviet bloc this already means two removes, as the government is not even his own.
>
> The second layer is pride of nation. ("I will show the others that we count.")
>
> The third layer is pride of person. ("I will show the others that *I* count.")
>
> The fourth layer is translation.
>
> The fifth layer is amplification.
>
> And the sixth layer is the kind of diplomatic protocol which demands that certain thoughts be expressed in certain phrases: "It has come to our attention," "My delegation, therefore, feels compelled," and of course all that family of noble terms—"peace with justice," "rally world sentiment," and "with due respect for the sovereignty"—which slip through the holes of one's attention like rubbed-out coins.

The cliches of the West may be dulling enough, but the cliches of the Soviet bloc are positively numbing in their relentless perversion. It is hard to imagine how even they can endure the ceaseless iterations of "fascist cliques," "imperialist aims," and "counter-revolutionary bandits."

The moments when the window opens and the man comes through are so rare that they bring inordinate relief: the Greek delegate, speaking of Hungary, "For once I agree with the United Kingdom!"; the Australian delegate, booming out in his hearty voice the name of the distinguished Ambassador from Peru, Dr. Belaunde, as "Dr. Belly-Undie"; and the times when delegates speak simply and truly in plain English, as Mr. Schurmann of the Netherlands did in a short speech—"It smacks of rhetoric to say that the United Nations is a forum for the conscience of the world. Let us state more modestly that we are a sounding board for the opinion of a great many nations in the world. And if that opinion is strong enough and united enough, it cannot fail to have its influence on those who commit these evil deeds. At this moment it is *their* consciences—if they still have them—we should seek to reach."

THE PRINTER VISITED. A year ago this April, ST and a friend dropped in to see the printer to pay their respects, and to leave a small, private order. The Artcraft Press, with Heath Meriwether as chief, is located on the edge of the University of Missouri campus in Columbia. It was a warm, leisurely spring morning, and being temporarily relieved of our duties as critics at the high school speech festival sponsored by the University, we were in relaxed mood. But as soon as we opened the door of the shop, we were in the midst of things. The *QJS* was being stitched and sent on for covers, and *Speech Monographs* and *The Speech Teacher* were in various stages of printing. Rolling out of the bindery were copies of *Daniel Webster and the Salem Murder*, by J. A. Winans and H. A. Bradley. As we sat chatting at the printer's desk, a boy came in with a letter from Winans. He said he had received the first copies the date he wrote, he was enclosing a check for the printing, but he hadn't time to write at length; he was taking off for the Eastern Association convention in New York. He added that a friend said, "It is a good looking job."

The printer revealed to us recently, after Winans died, some of the anecdotal details. It seems the author had wanted it done just so, to his specifications. Although we now know that unlike most retired professors he had the resources to have the book printed and bound in vellum, he drove a good bargain. In September '56, he wrote, "My chief ambition is to see this book in print." A month later he wrote that he didn't want to be "pushy," but he wanted "to see that book in print"; a man at 83 is "living on 'borrowed time.'" He made it, although his collaborator, a younger man, had died six years before. A few days before his death, Winans wrote the printer concerning an announcement about the book, to contain some testimonials he had received. Included in the list was a comment from his old friend and fellow-founder of SAA, Frank Rarig: "As interesting reading as a novel."

ART OF CONFERENCE. In one of those tag-end reviews of the year, there appeared some figures on the number of people Pope Pius XII had received in 1956, and the number of speeches he had made. Since he is 13 to 16 years beyond the retirement age of college professors, and has had some ill health, the figures seemed questionable. ST wanted to be correct, so he sent an inquiry. The reply was prompt:

Vatican City, January 24, 1957

The Secretariat of State of His Holiness is directed to acknowledge receipt of the kind message addressed to the Holy Father by Richard Murphy, under date of January 11, 1957, and in response to his inquiry, has pleasure in communicating that the Sovereign Pontiff, in the past year, received more than 1,000,000 persons in audience and delivered 132 Discourses.

So the report was correct. We forgot to ask how many languages were used, but a friend says that he had an audience with a group of a dozen people, and he recognized at least five languages used by His Holiness.

APPOINTMENTS

Cumberland College, Lebanon, Tennessee: Earle Roy Payne, head of English department and director of dramatics.

Denison University: Carl Weaver, DeWitte Holland.

Idaho State College: Roger Walters, radio and television.

Louisiana State University: Irene Huenefeld, George H. Gunn, assistant professors; C. Wesley Lambert, Arthur J. Jacobs, radio and television; Andrew Rasbury, theatre; Mary Jane Roberts, Valerie Smith, Lillian Hall, Mary Frances Hopkins, Joseph Mele, Billy Dean Parsons, Russell Everett, Jack Gravlee, Jack Carter, assistants in fundamentals and public address; Winton J. Lemoine, Elizabeth Roberts, assistants in radio; Mary Neale Fissel, assistant in theatre; Carolyn Jones, Edward Rynes, Gordon Duck, Beulah B. Rayner, Olga Marie Vaugn, William Bryce Evans, assistants in correction.

Martin College, Pulaski, Tennessee: William H. Wilson, assistant professor and director of forensics and radio.

New York University: Leon Bloom, instructor.

Oklahoma A & M: Gracelyn McCulloh, instructor.

Purdue University: Charles M. Monnier, instructor at the Indianapolis extension center; Herbert E. Rodgers, Donald L. Rosenberg, assistants in speech; Glenn Pang-Ching, Stephen W. Vargo, clinical assistants; Shirley Sills, speech therapist at center for retarded children in Lafayette, Indiana, a program sponsored by the Indiana State Board of Health through a grant from the U. S. Children's Bureau.

Queens College: Constance Connor Kuhns, Benjamin Kapen, lecturers.

South Dakota State College: Clarence E. Denton, Donald E. Sikkink, assistant professors;

Dadee Bruce, instructor; Burris Edwards, Sherill Price, George F. Reilly, Jeanne Grove, Dorothy West, Barbara Williams, graduate teaching assistants.

Syracuse University: Frank E. Funk, assistant professor in public address and industrial communications; Richard Shaefer, James Fellows, instructors in radio and television.

Texas College of Arts and Industries: Jack P. Clark, associate professor.

University of Akron: Merlin Bement, technical director of theatre.

University of Connecticut: Frank Ballard, technical director of theatre; Donald Murray, instructor.

University of North Carolina: Richard Douthit, instructor.

University of Oregon: John R. Shepherd, radio-television.

University of Wisconsin: Margaret Rainey, instructor in speech correction; Sara F. Cattle, instructor in speech education.

Wayne State University: John W. Gaeth, professor of speech, director of hearing clinic and associate director of speech clinic.

PROMOTIONS

City College, New York: Edward W. Mammen, professor; Louis Levy, associate professor; Rudolph Bednar, Marshall D. Berger, Stanley Weintraub, assistant professors.

Harvard University: Oscar H. Verlaine, instructor.

Hunter College: Charles Elson, associate professor.

Idaho State College: Hal J. Todd, assistant professor in speech-drama.

Queens College: Mardel Ogilvie, associate professor; Robert Dierlam, John Newman, assistant professors.

Syracuse University: Lawrence Myers, Jr., assistant professor in radio-television; Gerald F. Reidenbaugh, assistant professor in drama.

Teachers College, Columbia University: Paul Kozelka, professor.

University of Oregon: Glenn Starlin, chairman of the department of speech, replacing Robert D. Clark, now dean of the College.

SUMMER PROGRAMS

When the University of Colorado *Summer Session Bulletin* comes in, as fresh and blooming as the seed catalogues that come in the same February mail, you know it's time to think of self-improvement combined with recreation. Visiting lecturers at Colorado this summer, who, no doubt, will take a few days off in July to go snowballing in the Rockies, are: Charles Gaupp and Polly Gaupp of Portland State College, who will work in the drama area; Rex Robinson, Utah State Agricultural College, who will have courses in public address; and Joseph Sheehan of UCLA, who will be concerned with speech and hearing disorders.

The summer courses and workshops offer great variety. At the University of Arizona, the annual workshop in speech correction will be be held during the first session. Miss Ardis Newholm, speech and hearing consultant of the Arizona Society for Crippled Children and Adults, will be visiting lecturer and consultant. Cornell University will sponsor an experimental Seminar in Communication for business and industrial personnel. The intensive, two-week seminar will run from June 17-28 and will concentrate on persistent problems in speaking, reading, and writing. Members of the Department of Speech and Drama, the Department of English, and the Director of the Reading Improvement Program at Cornell are collaborating in preparing the program of study.

The University of Denver will sponsor its tenth summer workshop in basic communication from June 24 to July 25.

The University of Houston will hold a two-week workshop for high school students interested in debate, public speaking, radio-TV and drama. Similar workshops are planned at the University of Illinois and the State University of Iowa.

At Iowa, the high school teachers will hold a workshop concurrently with the student workshop from June 24 through July 19. The University of Maine will conduct a diagnostic speech and hearing clinic. John J. Pruis, Western Michigan College of Education, will be a visiting professor at the University of Maine, teaching courses in speech education.

At the University of New Mexico, Bernard Cooper will direct a radio-television workshop for four weeks. The Northern Illinois State College and the Illinois Division of Services for Crippled Children will conduct a summer speech and hearing center for brain-injured children, auditorially handicapped, and children with cleft lip and palate. At Stanford's speech and hearing clinic, James Carrell, director of the speech and hearing clinic of the University of Washington, will be visiting staff member.

Many schools are arranging summer workshops in interpretation and drama. Northwestern University is planning a symposium on the oral interpretation of literature, featuring lec-